The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ARL-960

FRANCISCAN EDUCATION

14
A

FRANCISCAN EDUCATION

A SYMPOSIUM OF ESSAYS

(about education, formation of friars
in gen.)

WITHDRAWN

EDITED BY

FELIX M. KIRSCH, O. M. CAP., LITT. D.
CAPUCHIN COLLEGE, CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

20930
DISCARDED
CAPUCINORUM
BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM

THE BRUCE PUBLISHING COMPANY
NEW YORK—MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN—CHICAGO

The Catholic
Theological Union
LIBRARY
Chicago, Ill.

Cum Permissu Superiorum

Nihil Obstat
JOANNES M. LENHART, O.M.Cap.
Censor Deputatus

Imprimatur
✠ MICHAEL J. CURLEY
Archiepiscopus Baltimorensis

Baltimore, Md.
Oct. 29, 1929

Copyright, 1929
FELIX M. KIRSCH

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

143
K63
Province of St. Joseph
Capuchin-Franciscan Libr.
Mt. Calvary, Wisconsin

INTRODUCTION

The present-day cult of St. Francis of Assisi is one of the marvels of our age. The Little Poor Man is everybody's saint. A play dealing with his life won for its author the first prize in a national poetry contest and was presented on Broadway. When eloquent lecturers desire a fashionable subject they select the theme of the Poverello. It is significant that the three best biographies we have of the Saint have been brought out by non-Catholic publishers. It is significant, too, that *Everyman's Library* has three numbers dealing with St. Francis. The statue of the Saint was selected for the Cathedral of St. John the Divine on the ground that the Poverello represented the spirit of the thirteenth century at its best.

It is well known that pastors of Protestant churches will not hesitate to preach whole series of sermons on the Seraphic Saint. The Salvation Army has spread abroad thousands of copies of its *Life of St. Francis*, and the author of the book contends that it is the object of the Salvation Army to spread throughout the world the spirit of the Saint of Assisi. There is a Protestant Third Order of Saint Francis in England as well as in France. Among the more than one hundred students enrolled in the Summer School of Franciscan Studies conducted in 1928 by the Capuchin Fathers at Oxford University, only twenty were Catholic. An Episcopalian church in Boston is dedicated to St. Francis. Milliners in Paris have commercialized the enthusiasm for St. Francis by making little birds for women's hats which they call " Oisseaux à la St. François."

Protestant missionaries in Japan have translated the writings of the Saint as well as other Franciscan literature, and disseminated them among the natives. The Poverello was the favorite saint of Ruskin, of Longfellow, of Lowell—all men who knew relatively little about the Church, but who could not escape the charm of the Umbrian Saint. Some of our public libraries have found it good policy to display a shelf of Franciscan literature. Socialists have acclaimed St. Francis as their leader because they see him stamping on wealth. Naturalists have anointed him their

pontiff because they see him preaching to a flock of birds. Philanthropists say he is their patron because while they stand back they see him kissing the leper. Indeed, there are thousands of children of the world who if they could have one choice of meeting any saint personally, that choice would almost certainly be Francis of Assisi.

Yet, it is one thing to wish to meet the Saint, and quite another to be willing to follow him. Pope Pius XI reminded the world in his Encyclical on St. Francis that imitation is immeasurably better than admiration. Still, for the past seven hundred years there have always been thousands who took St. Francis into their lives, who wore his habit and followed his Rule. The world is the richer for their holy lives. The account of their accomplishments is a golden story. The Rev. Isidore O'Brien, O.F.M., has given us brief, but picturesque snatches of the story. He tells us how the Saint shook the kneeling Monks to their feet, made Friars out of them, and sent them in two's to preach the Gospel to the whole world. Between that day and this, they have walked with the Gospel in long procession into every country of the globe. The Balkan States slaughtered them, but they kept coming there for five hundred years. North African Mohammedans knelt for baptism at their feet. The farthest points of Tartary and China were visited by them while Marco Polo was yet a dreaming boy in his father's warehouse. Aito II of Armenia laid aside his royal robes and girt himself in the brown of St. Francis in 1295. Father John Albuquerque welcomed St. Francis Xavier to Goa in 1542. Malabar and the Coromandel Coast, Ceylon and the jungles of Berar, Bengal, Burma, and Siam were trod by them. Sumatra, Borneo, Java, Celebes, Solor, Sangi, Ternate, and the Malay Peninsula ran red with their blood.

Before 1897, 4,037 Friars had died in the Philippines, and one of them had given the Tagalog tongue its first greater poem. St. Francis himself had gone to Palestine in 1219, and under Gregory IX his Friars took charge of the holy places there; and six thousand of their martyred bodies crumble to dust through the hill country of Judea.

They stood by Columbus and gave him shelter in their Friary at La Rábida when his friends deserted him. They came with him to the New World and penetrated its expansive depths, winning the wild forest children with the smiles and songs their father

had taught them. They sailed around the Cape and walked through the Antilles and Mexico, erecting chapels and schools. They entered California, and wrote a litany of their Order in the towns along its coast. . . . Such is the merest skeleton of the results of St. Francis' pushing the dreamy Monk out into the stimulating sunlight of the world.

We believe that a man whose example and teaching have inspired such glorious deeds will have a message for our modern world. And for modern education, too. At the present time when our leaders are lamenting the evils of standardization in our schools, we may well turn to the individualism of St. Francis for relief. At a time when there is so much regimentation in educating the masses, the founder of the Franciscan Order may well give us a lesson emphasizing the value of personality and individuality. At a time when State autocracy and centralizing forces and accrediting agencies are throttling private initiative and are killing originality, we may take a cue from the example of the man who destroyed the feudal system of the thirteenth century, who taught the poor serf of that dark day that he still could have hope, and who prepared the way for that glorious democracy that should remain our inheritance.

Christ's words: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added unto you," are being forgotten in most of our American schools, and "these things," "the lesser things" of life, are engrossing the attention of the masses, and even of our leaders. "Blessed are we who live in the now," was the anthem sung at the recent dedication of a large department store, and this song is the song of the age; and Christ's words are inverted to read: "Seek ye first all other things, and let the kingdom of God be an addition, or appendix, of life." Will it not be helpful, then, to turn to the Little Poor Man of God who measured everything by the standard of other-worldliness, and whose personal life and that of his faithful followers offers convincing proof of the blessedness of his philosophy?

At the present time the pendulum is swinging back from the extreme intellectualism so long prevalent in our schools and in our educational philosophy that taught the all-sufficiency of knowledge and thus perpetuated the heresy first propounded by Satan in Paradise concerning the tree of knowledge: "In what day soever

you shall eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened, and you shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Our educators are beginning to appreciate the value of the emotions and of the will, and hence they will find in the voluntarism of St. Francis and the Franciscan School the missing link of our educational psychology. The pride of intellect likewise engendered by modern education will find a corrective in the life and teachings of the Saint who considered himself nobody, who saw God in everything, and who therefore is now the man everybody knows.

"By their fruits you shall know them." The Sons of St. Francis have occupied university chairs honorably, have conducted colleges successfully, and what is perhaps more telling evidence, have civilized savages by their educational methods. Brief reference was made above to their work in California. What the Spanish Padres found on their coming to California was a people as abject and low as was ever discovered anywhere. The Indians wore no clothes, but instead covered their bodies with cakes of mud. They built no houses, but lived in caves, holes, or shacks. They did not provide for the morrow. Day after day, year after year, their only occupation was to look for food, devour it, sit, talk, sleep, and idle away the time. They had no idea of God or religion; in fact, they had no conception of anything beyond the material and the sensuous. They had no family life, and sexual intercourse was largely promiscuous. The mother cared little for the lives of her children. The Indians neglected the sick, and often killed off the ill and the aged or allowed them to die unattended.

This was the situation that faced the Padres when they arrived in California. However, with superhuman courage they undertook to bring the Glad Tidings to the wretches sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death. They could not appeal to anything suprasensual, for that was beyond the Indians. Hence, the missionaries had to provide material comforts first. Still they planted the Cross, and then built their church. Adjoining the church they built walls and huts for the Indians, and gradually and with infinite patience succeeded finally in winning the confidence of the poor natives. And the ultimate result? A small walled city arose sheltering in several cases as many as 3,000 souls. The Mission was established, and the whole life of the Indians was changed. If the reader will turn to the account given by the Rev. Zephyrin

Engelhardt, O.F.M., in his *Missions and Missionaries of California*,[1] he will rub his eyes in amazement at what had been accomplished. One Mission after the other arose, each removed from its neighbor at a distance of one day's journey on horseback, until at last there were twenty-one such havens of refuge strung up and down the land like a string of pearls and offering material and spiritual comfort to thousands of Indians. From the year 1769, when the first mission was established, down to 1846 the Friars converted about 100,000 Indians from savagery to Christianity, built twenty-one costly and beautiful temples, and established twenty-one havens of refuge that dispensed material and spiritual comfort to thousands of natives. They gave the Indians grade schools and industrial schools in far greater number than they have today, after eighty years of American rule.

But the Friars have not only made educational history during the past seven hundred years, but have been producing valuable educational literature as well. Of course, most of this literature is not labeled educational, but possesses educational value nevertheless. For instance, the Rev. Fr. Modesto de Mieras, O.M.Cap., has shown in his essay "Valor pedagogico de los escritos de San Buenaventura"[2] how great is the educational value of much that has been written by the Seraphic Doctor. Again, even a cursory reading of some of the works of Roger Bacon will convince us of the modernity of much that was written by this thirteenth-century Friar who was the father of experimental science. Similarly, if our Catholic philosophers would give more heed to the writings of Scotus, they would find it less of a task to produce that synthesis of Scholastic and modern philosophy that is one of the needs of the day.

It was the consideration of these and similar needs that induced the Friars of the Franciscan Educational Conference to take up the subject of Franciscan education at their Eleventh Annual Meeting held at St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N. Y., on June 28, 29, and 30, 1929. In dealing with the subject of education the Friars not only continued a Franciscan tradition, but also looked to the future. Recent developments would seem to indicate that the Franciscan apostolate of teaching will increase largely

[1] San Francisco: James H. Barry Co., 1912, Vol. II, p. 253 ff.
[2] *Revista de Estudios Franciscanos* (Barcelona, 1910), IV, p. 38 ff.

in the future. The Friar educators are no longer confined to training the prospective members of their Order, but in different sections of the country they are in charge of high schools and colleges, and indications are that their activities in this direction will increase in the near future.

The papers and discussions presented at the Meeting of the Friars are published herewith in book form in the hope that they may be of interest to the many Catholic educators who are confronted with similar problems in their dealings with the young.

Felix M. Kirsch, O.M.Cap.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION v

END AND AIM OF FRANCISCAN EDUCATION, by the *Very Rev. Thomas Plassmann, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D.*, St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N. Y. 1

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI AS AN EDUCATOR AND HIS PEDAGOGICAL METHOD, by the *Rev. Robert Hammer, O.F.M., Ph.D.*, St. Francis' Monastery, New York, N. Y.—Discussion 9

FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL IDEALS, by the *Very Rev. Dunstan Dobbins, O.M.Cap., M.A., B.Litt.(Oxon)*, Franciscan House, Providence, R. I.—Discussion 41

CANONICAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING STUDIES FOR RELIGIOUS, by the *Rev. Valentine Schaaf, O.F.M., S.T.B., J.C.D.*, Franciscan Monastery, Catholic University of America.—Discussion 65

EDUCATION AS A SUBJECT IN OUR FRANCISCAN SCHOOLS, by the *Rev. Conrad O'Leary, O.F.M.*, St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, N. Y.—Discussion 86

THE TRAINING OF OUR FRANCISCAN TEACHERS, by the *Rev. Vincent Fochtman, O.F.M., Ph.D.*, Quincy College, Quincy, Ill.—Discussion 102

INDEX 117

FRANCISCAN EDUCATION

END AND AIM OF FRANCISCAN EDUCATION

THOMAS PLASSMANN, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D.

TO say that St. Francis was an educator, as we now commonly understand the term, would be an anachronism. To deny that St. Francis was in fervent sympathy with the work of education, as it was sponsored in his time and at all times by the Catholic Church, would be grossly to misunderstand his life, his Rule, and his spirit.

St. Francis has stamped his very soul upon the Order which he founded, and we who profess to be his spiritual sons do well at every turn of the road to look back and to seek in his example, both inspiration and direction. Today we might well ask ourselves the question: What would St. Francis do if he lived in our age; if he witnessed the present tremendous struggle between the sound old principles of Christian education and the powerful currents of modern thought and teachings?

St. Francis Our Guide and Inspiration

Assuredly St. Francis would not hesitate long to find the proper answer. With his native impulsiveness he would quote the Saviour's word: "Behold, I say to you, lift up your eyes, and see the countries; for they are white already to harvest." St. Francis never held back when he perceived the needs and desires of Mother Church.

A profound truth, and one which has a special significance in our day, underlies the catchy rhyme of Julian's classical characterization of the Seraphic Father: "Franciscus vir catholicus, et totus apostolicus." There are those who claim in unending variations that the apostolic Church was not a fact but a fiction; that it was merely a natural development from oriental mysticism with

a strong ingrowth of pagan mythology; that its reputed Founder was unwittingly the spokesman of subconscious experiences; and so forth. There are others who repudiate this claim, but assert with equal emphasis that the Church of the Middle Ages had far deviated from the primitive apostolic type; that it had become obscured, distorted and encumbered with Western formalism and absolutism in doctrine, practice, and government.

St. Francis silenced both contentions. With a master stroke he laid low the vagaries of the rationalist and the reformer alike. Unfortunately for them, they consider him their ideal saint because they find him so human, and yet, it is precisely his characteristic human outlook on life and religion which under the sweet influence of divine grace created in his life and belief such a happy and harmonious blending of what is truly apostolic and what is truly Catholic. To the Roman Pontiff with his much maligned "Romana Curia" he looked as to the true Vicar of Jesus Christ, and his "Lord Bishop" was no other than a true successor of the Apostles. In the priests of the Church he "discerned the Son of God." The seven sacraments were to his conviction so many real sources of divine grace. The Holy Eucharist he "honored above all things," because in this world he saw nothing bodily of the Most High Son of God "except His most sacred Body and His most Holy Blood." There was no shadow of a disturbing incongruity. The thirteenth century presented to him the identical realities and verities of the first. Palestine and Umbria were wedded by a sacred, ineffable bond. He found his Bethlehem at Grecio, his Cenacle at Portiuncula, his Calvary on Mount La Verna. Through the valleys and fields around medieval Assisi he traced his steps after Jesus of Nazareth and before the Tabernacle of stone or wood in old San Damiano he would spend hours in serene contemplation.

No wonder that the mere reading of the evangelical words, "Come, follow Me," should have fired his soul with the firm resolve, "Vivere secundum Sanctum Evangelium." No wonder that he wanted all his brethren to live this same mode of life, "ad literam, sine glossa."

This may seem a digression, but it is well to visualize St. Francis in this setting if we would determine his mind on any question that is as close to the heart of Mother Church as is the

St. Francis and Education

momentous question of Christian education. For obvious reasons St. Francis never made a formal pronouncement on education, but his life and writings leave no doubt as to his attitude. There was one type of learning that he detested from the bottom of his soul. It was learning for its own sake, the desire of which is begotten of pride and vainglory. In the spirit of the Book of Wisdom, where true wisdom or godliness is contrasted with the high-sounding "Sophia" of the Hellenic world, St. Francis warned his brethren against that knowledge which does not lead to God. St. Bonaventure stigmatizes it as the "curiositates philosophantium." Let us mark well, however, that St. Francis did not condemn secular learning because of its profane character. He condemned only the "science which puffeth up," but recommended the "science which edifies." His admonition to the lay brothers of the Order, "Non curent nescientes literas, literas discere," conveys the same thought in a more formal way, *viz.*, that godliness is to be sought rather than the knowledge of letters. In their ultimate analysis these restrictions will undoubtedly merit the endorsement of sound educators of all times. For the type of education which centers upon the "Ego" and excludes the "Sursum corda," is vain and futile, and furthermore, education of the heart and not purely intellectual training is the essence of all true culture.

The mind of St. Francis is even more forcibly expressed in certain positive recommendations. Above all he wanted his brethren to devote themselves to wholesome occupation "for the sake of good example and to prevent idleness." Those who are engaged in preaching are exhorted that "their discourses be examined and chaste," "for the utility and edification of the people." Lastly, he pleaded especially that honor and veneration are due to "all theologians and those who announce to us the most holy Divine Words as those who minister to us spirit and life."

Theology, then, the science which treats of God, or as Master Alexander puts it, "Scientia a Deo, de Deo, ad Deum," had a high place in the estimation of St. Francis. In fact, certain events in his life show that he deeply loved what St. Bonaventure calls the "Scientia perfecta." He was anxious that his Friars should acquire this science. His letter to St. Antony is a

proof. What he says to the preachers in particular applies to all teachers and students in general, and might be called a brief lesson in pedagogics. The preachers should prepare with painstaking care, " ut sint examinata et casta eorum eloquia, ad utilitatem et aedificationem populi, annuntiando eis vitia et virtutes, poenam et gloriam, cum brevitate sermonis, quia verbum abbreviatum fecit Dominus super terram."

While our holy Founder determined the aim of our educational work, Mother Church outlined its scope. Here it must be stated that education meant to St. Francis what it meant to Christ, and what it has meant at all times to the Church. It is education in its best and primitive Christian concept, the " bringing up " (educare) from the state of sin and ignorance to the state of grace and wisdom. When all educational precepts, theories and programs have said their say, it will be seen that the one immovable incubus which retards human endeavor in its search after true culture and refinement is original sin; that the only effective means to overcome this evil is found in the mysteries of the Incarnation and Redemption; that their application to mankind is effected only through our knowledge, love, and imitation of Jesus Christ.

That the Friars should educate the world in this sense, both by example and word, was the primary and fundamental precept of St. Francis. Nor could he fail to realize that education in its restricted sense, whether as a science or an art, was a powerful means to this end. And while he did not formally stipulate the extent to which this means should be employed, he actually forced it to the farthest extent in placing his Order with all its mental and moral resources at the unreserved service of the Church, ordaining that his Friars remain, " semper subditi et subjecti pedibus ejusdem sanctae Ecclesiae." His program was the program of Christ. " I confess before God," writes St. Bonaventure, " that, what made me love the life of Blessed Francis above all things, was its likeness to the beginning and progress of the Gospel. For as the Holy Gospel advanced and passed on from the hands of simple fishermen to those of the most celebrated and learned Doctors, the same progress you may also witness in the Order of Blessed Francis."

" By their fruits you shall know them." The Order realized its solemn duties from the start. Almost spontaneously did the

early Friars launch upon the educational work of the day and fearlessly they mastered the great problems that occupied the interest of the world and the solicitude of Mother Church. The new army felt that it should serve the Church where help was most needed. Though evincing a strong predilection for the Queen of Sciences, the scholars of the Order did not hesitate for an instant to delve into those sciences which, though secular in name and substance, were made to serve as the "ancillae Dominae Theologiae." The movement of the Spirituals could not stay the progress, for the need was actual, the danger real. Besides, the devout Franciscan could not help feeling a strong attraction towards those sciences, for even if they did not treat of God, they treated of God's work. Thus it happened that each one of the natural sciences has found a welcome nursery in some Franciscan Friary or in the quiet cell of a brown-robed student. For the better understanding of the wonders of nature must needs accrue to the praise and glory of the Creator. As the Seraphic Doctor says, "Deus qui est artifex et auctor naturae, per ipsam cognoscitur." And if perchance some of them, like Roger Bacon and Berthold Schwarz, were occasionally distracted in their meditations by their insistent craving for experiment and invention, certainly the Lord will pardon their neglect as the world appreciates their remarkable achievements. The science of medicine interested the early Franciscan because it enabled him to bring relief to the ailments and sufferings of his friends, God's poor. In philosophy he found a certain and direct road to the First Cause of all things. "There was no smith in Israel," remarks John of Rupella, but he thanks God that things have changed, for "the smiths who with their sharpened swords repel the onslaughts of the Philistines are our Masters in Philosophy." The department of arts and letters needed no introduction to the Order of St. Francis, for apart from the fact that the finest specimens of literary and poetic excellence have come from the intimate circle of St. Francis himself, who could not belie his refined natural taste for poetry and song, many of the early novices were Masters of Arts. Their undying services in adorning the Sacred Liturgy and enriching the vernacular tongues of Europe, are history. The Patron of Franciscan Schools, St. Bonaventure, delivered a master stroke when he wrote his immortal "De Reductione

Franciscans as Educators

Artium ad Theologiam." Here all the arts and sciences, sacred and profane, cultural and mechanical, are grouped around the Queen—Theology. The book reveals the Franciscan outlook on the educational field, and the author takes good care to stress the indispensable duty of every student and educator when he declares: "Ad gemitum orationis per Christum Crucifixum . . . lectorem invito, ne forte credat quod sibi sufficeret lectio sine unctione."

Characteristics of Franciscan Education

Perhaps the note struck by the Seraphic Doctor in the above quotation could be called the outstanding characteristic of all the great Franciscan educators and students. The spirit of devotion and of holy unction permeated their lectures and their writings, as even a cursory perusal of Franciscan prints and manuscripts will readily reveal. Originality might be considered as another characteristic. The originality of Franciscan teachers will explain why so many new movements have originated in the Franciscan School and among its scholars. While this characteristic has exerted a vitalizing and enriching influence generally, it has none the less proved a dangerous handicap to the continuance of institutions and systems within the pale of the Franciscan Order. Alongside of originality we always find the note of practicalness. The Franciscan method is direct; it brooks no theorizing or long speculations, but is anxious to go to the root of the question. It sets out to deal with realities and truths, in accordance with the motto, "Credo ut intelligam," or in accordance with the motto of the Victorines, "Amo ut intelligam." The Franciscan system is synthetic rather than analytic. Another note is picturesqueness of presentation. The imagination is brought into play to aid the intelligence. Our great preachers, such as Bernardine, Berthold of Ratisbon, Brugmann and Theodorich of Coelde, were masters in this art. The same holds true of Peter Aureolus, Bukentop, and other Biblical commentators. The Franciscan teacher of the past strikes us as a man who used good psychology, who thoroughly understood his pupils and consequently was always master of the situation. Lastly, whether we should ascribe it to the Scotistic teaching concerning the "Primatus Voluntatis," or to the mystic tendency of the Order generally, or to both, we note in all Franciscan educa-

tors a strong leaning towards the training of the will and heart in preference to that of the intellect. The Franciscan teachers always set the "inflammatio cordis" before the "illuminatio mentis." It all comes back to the time-honored Franciscan motto: "In Sanctitate et Doctrina," the stress being on the "Sanctitas."

The spirit of the Franciscan Rule is that the brethren should adapt themselves "secundum tempora et loca et frigidas regiones." In educational work they have been true to this program. They looked upon education as the handmaid of the preaching of the Gospel, no matter whither they wended their way, to the great metropolis or the humble hamlet, to the civilized centers of Europe or to the foreign mission field. It is a strange anomaly to see the Friars ascend the cathedras of medieval seats of learning in their most glorious epoch, and to witness them, some hundred years later, founding the first parochial schools for the Indians in North America.

It was principally because the Franciscan School set for itself from the very start a program, as comprehensive and far-reaching as the great Catholic program of the Church Herself, that it has produced leaders in practically every field of educational endeavor. A few names, picked at random, will tell the story: Alexander, Bonaventure, Duns Scotus; Roger Bacon, Bartholomaeus Anglicus and John Giles Zamora; Nicholas of Lyra, De la Haye and Cardinal Ximenez; Raymond Lully, Marius of Clavasio and Alexander Villedieu; Angelus of Clavasio with his retinue of Summulists; Elbel, Sporer and Reiffenstuel; Odoric of Perdonone, John of Monte Corvino and Cardinal Massaja; Peter of Gand and Gregory Girard.

Franciscan Educators

When we review the landmarks of Franciscan education, beginning with Paris, Oxford, Salamanca and Bologna; then the Collegio di Sant' Isidoro, with the indefatigable Wadding at its head, the Oriental School at San Pietro in Montorio, the Biblical Institute or "Athenaeum Biblicum" at Antwerp, and lastly in our own day, the international Collegio di Sant' Antonio, the University of the Sacred Heart at Milan, the Schola Scriptorum at Quaracchi, besides the countless, flourishing colleges and "Studia" under Franciscan direction all over the globe, it is evident that the Friars

Franciscan Schools

have never lost sight of the lofty educational ideals heralded by their ancestors.

Let these examples be our inspiration during these sessions which shall be devoted to the sacred cause of education, and let us fasten another link in this glorious chain of Franciscan traditions—" In Sanctitate et Doctrina."

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI AS AN EDUCATOR AND HIS PEDAGOGICAL METHOD*

Robert Hammer, O.F.M., Ph.D.

VIEWING the Franciscan Order as it exists in the twentieth century we are confronted with the question: Is this really the same Order founded by the Poverello of the thirteenth century? Does not the true picture of the Poverello stand in sharp contrast to all of the varied and far-reaching activities of the Franciscan Order today? In vain has the attempt been made to twist the ideals of St. Francis in an effort to fabricate a justification of modern activities and to harmonize apparent contradictions. We can not do violence to the extreme idealism of St. Francis without at the same time doing violence to history. For example, it is to no purpose to represent St. Francis as the friend and patron of learning, as Hilarin Felder has attempted to do in his *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden.*

Interpreting St. Francis

The attempt to defend the modern attitude of the Order towards learning in this manner has no historical foundation. Let us rather leave to the Saint his ideal extremes and his extreme idealism, else he is no longer the real Poverello of Assisi. It is Francis the Idealist who has attracted the present-day world so forcibly that it has adopted this thirteenth century Saint as its own. Should not the Order founded by this "Modern Saint" also find its place in the modern world? It is the very idealism of the Saint that explains all apparent contradictions satisfactorily. It was precisely his extreme idealism that led him to take that final and most important step in his life, as far as his Order is concerned—the step which has since directed the development of our Order—namely, the unreserved giving-over of his Order to the Church.

Cardinal Hugolino succeeded in drawing Francis' ideals down from dizzy heights to a plane more accessible to the average

* Translated for the Franciscan Educational Conference by the Rev. Victor Mills, O.F.M., Rochester, N. Y.

mortal. The Cardinal knew that Francis himself was not favorably disposed towards such a mitigation, and though Hugolino may have had his own regrets, he saw clearly the necessity of his action. It may have been the greatest tragedy of Francis' life to be forced to sacrifice his ideals on the altar of the Church, but he had always placed the wisdom and judgment of the Church above his own. In his Testament we find, it is true, a reference to the first days at Rivo Torto like a sigh of longing, yet the Founder remains resolute and firm " subjectus pedibus ecclesiae."

That students of Franciscan history who are antagonistic towards the Church, reproach her for the change effected in the Order, should not surprise us. We know as well as they that the Order to-day is no longer what Francis first planned and hoped for his foundation in as far as he gave thought at all to a foundation of any extent. The child has grown and developed quite differently than the father had hoped; but it is still his child. If blame there be, it is the fault of the Mother who took the child from the arms of the dying father to rear it as she knew best. The Franciscan Order is precisely what the Church with her vision, prudence and age-old experience has made of it. If, therefore, the educational aims of our Order are somewhat changed; if they have departed somewhat from the extreme ideals of the Founder and have been made to conform to inexorable demands, there is at least one thing that has remained unchanged—the Spirit of St. Francis. To keep this spirit alive has become the beautiful and sacred mission of the educators of the Order.

I.

Psychological Principles of the Founder

All founders of religious orders were of necessity religious educators. The personal characteristics of each founder have been impressed more or less deeply on the Order he founded. It requires no stretch of the imagination to see in the characteristics which single St. Francis out so prominently, the marks of an educator in the real sense of the word.

There are especially three qualities which characterize the personality of St. Francis and give him the appeal which has caused the modern world to call him " Sweet St. Francis."

1. All during his life St. Francis showed a fine understanding for individuality. He himself was no individualist; neither was he a subjectivist as some non-Catholic authors delight in picturing him. His unreserved obedience and child-like submission to the Church are proofs of this. But we can easily understand how these authors arrive at their conclusion: it is the fact of Francis' tender regard for individuality. He had no mould into which every character must be fitted. Personality was most important to him. Hence it is that modern pedagogy stands rapt in wonderment and admiration before the picture of the Saint. The modern world vigorously protests against a mould in the domain of the intellect and makes a fetish of originality. But it would seem that this tendency is but the working-out of the law of contrasts, for the age of the machine tends more and more to fit things into a mould. The intellect, however, constantly seeks personality. And in St. Francis we find this personality.

Understanding for Individuality

Even in his youth Francis showed that he possessed the art of leadership, that he knew how to command so as to be obeyed. His young friends acknowledged this gift when they made him their leader. Even then he had the gift of bringing souls together and holding them. Without this gift he would never have become the great conqueror of souls which the sources show him to have been. With rare delicacy of feeling he knew how to make the democratic character of his Order appeal to the noble and the lowly, the learned and unlearned. He knew how to deal with each personality and to make each feel at home in the new and unusual relationship into which his great ideals had drawn them. The *Vita Prima* of Celano relates that when "viri literati et quidem nobiles" entered the Order, Francis did not treat them as one might expect in such an ascetical community specially dedicated to Poverty, but he was "animo nobilissimus et discretus."[1] In the *Chronicle* of Jordanus[2] we read how Francis treated with special respect Brother Peter who accompanied him to Syria. In this same *Chronicle,* Peter is called "juris peritus et dominus legum," and it is said that Francis always called him "Dominus

Art of Leadership

[1] I Celano, i, 57.
[2] *Chron. Jord.*, ii, ed. Boehmer, p. 11.

Petrus, quia frater Petrus vir literatus erat et nobilis." It was the same understanding for individuality and knowledge of human nature which enabled Francis to convert the "Brother Robbers" by first appeasing their bodily appetites. Likewise his conversion of the robber chieftain which gave rise to the legend of the "Wolf of Gubbio" [3] is characteristic: he made an agreement with him based only on the natural quality of honor which was dormant in him.

Knowledge of Human Nature

In a still greater degree do we find Francis' kindliness and knowledge of human nature manifested in the circle of his disciples. He had an understanding for every difficulty and with tender regard for all circumstances knew how to strike the proper tone when he had to deal with a contentious or troublesome Friar. When any of the brothers were subject to violent temptation, Francis met the situation with a tender understanding and by placing the blame on the devil made the brother feel that it had not lessened Francis' regard for him. "Vix alicui fratrum tanta posset mentis inesse turbatio, quod ad ejus ignitum eloquium non discederet omne nubilum rediretque serenum." [4] Even Cardinal Hugolino felt the influence of Francis' ability to dispel clouds from a troubled mind. "Testatur ipse (Hugo Ostiensis) de eo (Francisco) quod nunquam esset in tanta perturbatione seu animi motu quod visione ac allocutione Sancti Francisci non omne mentis nubilum discederet rediretque serenum effugaretur arcidia et gaudium aspiraret." [5] The sunny disposition of the *Joculator Dei* and his cheerful words gave an educational value to his very presence. And in proportion to his power to conquer souls was he a religious educator—an educator such as has seldom appeared in history.

Kindliness

2. To this gift of leadership there was added a fine power of observation. When Francis read the deepest secrets of the soul and the innermost thoughts of his brethren he was looked upon as a divinely inspired seer. Yet much if not all of this can be attributed solely to natural sagacity and the gift of penetration. We are by no means obliged to follow the great mystic, St. Bonaventure, in attributing everything in Francis to higher revelation. In so

Power of Observation

[3] II Cel., ii, 35. [4] I Cel., i, 46. [5] I Cel., ii, 101.

far as we know Francis from his biographies we can explain many things by his knowledge of human nature and his keen power of observation which enabled him to read thoughts which were apparently concealed in the souls of his brethren, but which in reality stood written on their countenances or were revealed in their bearing to one who had the natural gifts which Francis possessed.

It often happens that Francis foretold an evil end for a Friar whom all the brethren revered as a saint. But Francis could easily detect in such a one the lack of simplicity and humility which he ever held to be the sine qua non of a true vocation to the Order. If Francis' prediction then proved to be correct it is not necessary immediately to conclude that he spoke in virtue of a special gift of prophecy. Francis knew the spirit of his foundation better than anyone else and his estimate of a personality could easily be made from traits which were not apparent to the casual observer. "Multorum quoque, qui stare videbantur, ruinam et plurimum perversorum conversationem ad Christum immobili veritate praenuntians." [6] writes Bonaventure.

We need not search long in the sources for concrete examples. One incident will suffice to illustrate this gift of which we speak. It is an event which occurred just as Francis returned from his trip to the Orient. He was worn and tired and even then bore in his body the germs of the disease of which he died. He was therefore obliged to ride an ass. Brother Leonard, who was his companion, was wearily plodding along at his side. As Leonard trudged along he unconsciously and without malice began to make a comparison between his own noble parents and the parents of the Founder who were only merchants. And now the son of noble parents walked along the servant of the son of a merchant. A glance at Leonard's face as well as the solicitous thought that his companion must be very tired, led Francis to the same line of thought. But how great was Leonard's astonishment when Francis dismounted and said: "Non convenit Frater, ut ego equitem, tu venias pedes, quia nobilior et potentior in saeculo me fuisti." [7]

St. Francis and Brother Leonard

[6] *Opera Omnia*, XI, 10, p. 538.
[7] II Cel., ii, 31. Bonav., XI, 8, p. 53.

We know not which to admire most, the humility and simplicity of the Poverello or the tender regard and tact with which he treated his disciple of noble birth, or the deep knowledge of human nature and sharp penetration which this event reveals. It was only natural, therefore, that such occurrences should make a deep impression on his disciples and arouse that trust and confidence which is the foundation of successful education. In such a school there was no need of insisting on authority or of urging the necessity of respecting it. This was all accomplished by the force of love. "Vere cognoverunt fratres super servum suum Franciscum spiritum Domini in tanta plenitudine quievisse, quod post illius doctrinam et vitam erat eis proficisci tutissimum." [8]

Francis Inspires Confidence in His Disciples

Hence not only the Founder's doctrine but also his example and life was coördinated in his educational work, so that Celano could write of him: "Hoc (*sc.* exemplum praecedens) autem ipsi fratres pii magistri discipuli, summa cum diligentia observare curabant, quia non ea tantum, quae beatus Pater dicebat eis fraterno concilio seu imperio, verum etiam si ea quae cogitabat quae meditabatur ipse aliquo scire possent indicio studebant efficacissime adimplere." [9]

An educator who knew how to train his disciples in such a spirit, could rule a multitude from a sick bed.[10] However, the remarkable increase in the Order made it impossible for Francis to educate each of the Friars personally, hence the necessity of appointing a vicar to govern the fraternity in the last years of the Founder's life. With the great increase in the Order the lack of close organization became evident. And this reveals to us another characteristic of the personality of Francis which has also been inherited by his Order.

Growth of the Order Prevents Individual Education

3. "Sancta paupertas confundit omnem cupiditatem et avaritiam et curas hujus saeculi." [11] Thus Francis sings in praise of poverty in his hymn on the virtues. This was the solution of

[8] Bonav., VIII, 4, p. 514.
[9] I Cel., i, 45.
[10] *Speculum Perfectionis*, c. 71.
[11] *Laudes de Virtutibus*, Boehmer, *Analecten*, p. 65.

Poverty in Francis' System of Education

the old, old problem in the world of dualistic asceticism. To seek liberty of spirit by physical separation from the things of the world was in itself not a new solution of the problem. And yet in the case of Francis the result was incomparably greater than ever before. Liberty of spirit became a characteristic of the Order from its beginning. The radical disavowing of an ego-centric world-view by a complete renunciation of all goods and the acceptance of the evangelical ideal as proclaimed in the Franciscan ideal of poverty, gave rise to a theo-centric world-view in which asceticism and joy became inseparable companions.

It was not freedom of thought which Francis preached—and herein he differs essentially from the Waldensians and similar sects of the thirteenth century who broke with the Church—but freedom of love in the sense of the well known words of St. Augustine: "Ama et fac quod vis." Francis' piety was thoroughly Augustinian. A religion of the intellect such as St. Thomas Aquinas favoured was as foreign to Francis as was the training of his mind from the discipline of the Scholastics, or his mysticism from the ceremonial of monasticism.

Liberty of Spirit

Francis did not want his disciples to be hedged in with a thousand little prescriptions or ascetical prohibitions which frowned on the innocent joys of childlike spirits. He was the most liberal of all founders of religious orders. He had no understanding for formulas or formalities because they did not spring spontaneously from the heart. The ideal which he ever had before him and which he had planted in his school, appeared to him so high and supported by such motives that it would have been dragged from its heights and have lost its beauty by limitations and prohibitive statutes. Everything was to spring from the heart and be comprehended by the spirit, hence, as we shall see, instruction played a lesser rôle in his method of education than example. "Sanctus Franciscus dicebat fratribus saepe: peccator jejunare potest, orare plangere, carnemque propriam macerare; hoc solum non potest Domino scilicet suo esse fidelis." [12] Hence Francis could not accept the suggestion of Innocent III to adopt one of the existing religious rules for his life, since his

[12] Bonav., VI, 63, p. 530.

ideal was broader and freer than that of the existing monastic orders.

Francis was not a General of the Order in the later accepted sense of the word; he was its life-giving principle and teacher in the sense of a prophet of God. He never considered himself an ambassador of the Church, but rather an ambassador of God, although unwittingly he became one of the Church's greatest reformers. Francis would not have the ideal of renunciation consist of a series of external duties and prescriptions, or human regulations exceeding even the great ideal of the Gospel. He feared lest a Rule of this kind would engender in the hearts of the brethren the idea that its mere observance was a guarantee of sanctity. Although such a Rule had the appearance of greater strictness and severity, Francis could detect its weakness. The love of God should be left free, built up only on God's word. When Francis was obliged for the first time to frame his ideal into a Rule in order to obtain the approval of the Pope, the result was the stringing together of those Scriptural texts which had effected his own conversion. "Nemo ostendebat mihi quid deberem facere, sed ipse Altissimus revelavit mihi quod deberem vivere secundum forman Sancti Evangelii. Et ego paucis verbis et simpliciter feci scribere et Dominus Papa confirmavit mihi." [13]

Francis an Ambassador of God

This deep consciousness of being a prophet is the reason why the great Umbrian Saint is placed in a false light by many authors, as if he were a subjectivist whose wings were clipped by the Roman Curia. Francis was not a subjectivist. He was an outspoken individual but not an individualist. We know that he placed his institute unreservedly in obedience at the feet of the Church and that afterwards as before, there remained in it as an outstanding characteristic the greatest freedom as well as the capability and possibility of free development in the pursuit of the love of God.

A result of this freedom was the great confidence with which Francis inspired his disciples. Liberty of action for the individual conformed with the apostolic ideals. Frequently in the

[13] *Testament of St. Francis.*

Liberty of Action

sources we find instances where Francis was asked to give a definite assignment so that the brother concerned would know what he should do according to the will of God. But Francis always left it to the brother's own conscience and sense of responsibility. We need only mention the letter to Brother Leo in which Francis replies to Leo's request: "In quocunque modo melius videtur tibi placere Domino Deo et sequi vestigia et paupertatem suam, faciatis cum benedictione Dei et mea obedientia." [14]

How beautiful is this joining of personal liberty and obedience, how pleasing the confidence that speaks in these lines! On the other hand, Brother Giles was not satisfied "quod in tam libera obedientia vivere nolebat," so Francis assigned an objective for his activity.

It is quite clear that such an ideal organization of a human society could not endure with the great increase in the number of its members. In fact, we may say that the later numerous divisions of the Order were a result of this freedom of spirit which did not permit the extinction of differences of individualities and nationalities as is the case in other Orders in which all the members are made to conform exteriorly to a given standard. Yet it is a characteristic of the personality of the Seraphic Patriarch and of his educational work which we must always view with admiration: it is a glimpse of a more beautiful world where freedom from law is the same as being above the law. It is this spontaneous springing-forth of an ideal above all petty formulas crystallized into a mystical institute which gives the early Franciscan foundation the fresh color and naturalness which enrapture us.

Francis had much to learn from reality. He learned to bend the will of the Friars to authority, and slowly, but very slowly, to introduce organization. But he never became a master in this domain. He had neither talent nor taste for organization or the use of constraint. But others assisted him by advice and coöperation. And so the picture of the original foundation changes from year to year. From 1220 on, or if we wish, from the Chapter of 1219, the development of the Order along lines of stricter organization takes place rapidly. From a government by means of an ideal alone

Organization

[14] *Epist. ad Leonem*, Boehmer, p. 69.

embodied in the delicate strokes of the *Regula Prima* and the living rule afforded by the person of the Founder, from the simplest possible system of the first years there was the change in 1223 to a definite but more or less casuistic Rule. The General Chapters which originally were such colorful and edifying meetings of the Friars under the open skies, became under the hand of the organizer, closed parliaments. The freedom of action and movement which had been imitated from the apostolic form of life and which later had a parallel in the military Orders in the Church, but which was opposed to the *stabilitas loci* of monasticism, was limited by canonical obedience. We can not assert that Francis was opposed to this new order of things; he most probably saw the absolute necessity of stricter organization but perhaps clung to the hope that in spite of it his ideal would prevail.

II.

St. Francis' Methods of Education

Modern pedagogy speaks of method as the body of principles necessary to reach the desired end of education. If we compare the division of principles enumerated by modern pedagogy with the educational principles employed by St. Francis we are perhaps surprised to find that, judged by modern standards Francis stands out as an educator of the first rank. From a glance at the principles which Francis used, we see clearly that it was by no means accidental that the later Franciscan schools adopted the primacy of the will, but that this was in keeping with the spirit of the Order. It would lead us too far to go into detail as to how Francis applied these principles, but a brief examination of the results will be in place.

Method

1. Motivation laid the foundation of Franciscan life. The Christo-centric motive is the one most frequently employed. Even the official Rule of 1223 on which legal minds like Hugolino had coöperated, could not reject these motivating texts of the gospel, although comparison with the *Regula non bullata* of 1221 shows an almost heartless mutilation of the Rule as Francis would have it written. No less than sixty words of Christ are introduced as motives into the *Regula non bullata* and one hundred and eight texts are scattered throughout. The *Regula bullata* of 1223 retains only ten Scriptural

Motivation

texts, which, in keeping with the legal form of that Rule, are norm-giving rather than motivating.

Although Francis had engaged the help of the learned Caesar of Speyer in writing the *Regula non bullata,* it is the Founder alone who speaks in its lines. Other motives which are used are of a secondary character. Among these, motives of reward and punishment hold the first place. Francis showed his knowledge of human nature by stressing motives of reward and punishment not only when he himself preached to the people but also when he trained his Friars to preach. The more advanced souls are on the way of perfection, the more do these motives disappear from Francis' discourses and the purer motives of unselfish love of God and the following of Christ come to the fore. If we compare the *Regula non bullata* of 1221 with the Rules of other religious Orders, we immediately notice the stress laid on motives and the absence of minute instruction which other Rules emphasize. It is in this Rule that we detect for the first time traces of the system of the primacy of the will which plays such an important part in the educational work of St. Francis. The Friars must fulfil their obligations freely and of their own volition and must above all else avoid pharisaical formality. Francis is not so much concerned with *what* is done as with *how* it is done.

Motives of Reward and Punishment

Primacy of the Will

2. There may well be a difference of opinion as to the place which example occupies in the educational system of St. Francis. Were we to extend our investigation to his educational activities among the people, we should without doubt be obliged to consider example of prime importance. But with Francis, preaching (i. e., motivation) and example are inseparable, like light and heat coming forth from the same fire. But since we must confine ourselves to his activity in the Order we are obliged to assign a secondary place to example. His example was illustration, and illustration is of secondary importance.

Example

However, under certain circumstances illustration may become of prime importance for the understanding, and this was the case with many examples of the Founder. Example in general remained secondary because Francis did not wish to have the Friars imitate him, but Christ. Hence the disciples were motivated to

imitate Christ, illustration of which was given by the Founder and holy brethren. A characteristic instance is found in the sources where Francis wished to teach the first disciples to beg alms. In the beginning he himself went begging day after day in the hope that his example would have the desire effect. But in vain. Whereupon he delivered a lecture full of affection on Christocentric motives and sent them begging. Francis' example may have been a consolation to the Friars in their begging, but it was not the reason of their going.

It would be false, however, to assert that Francis underestimated the value of example. On the contrary he knew that good example makes a lasting impression. We need only recall the curse he spoke over the brother who gave scandal. The reason why the first place can not be assigned to example as a pedagogical principle is precisely because that place is impregnably held by motivation. Motivation loses its power if the principal rôle be assigned to human example. The only power which example can have is to influence the will. According to sound principles of pedagogy therefore, example comes after motives.

There is one thing which must not be overlooked if we are to get an idea of the personality of St. Francis as an educator and that is his ability to clothe his ideal with color and poetry. It is only when we look at this side of his character that we can understand the unique personality of the Saint. Two principal ideas are found in the Franciscan ideal. The first is: God is conceived as the "Lord" and "Prince" to Whom Francis devotes his service. The other is: Poverty is conceived as the "Lady" of the Knights of the Round Table. The consequences translated into reality were naturally hard. The sources bring innumerable instances of how Francis used this chivalric and poetic idea in his educational endeavors. He enlivened bitter reality with love and covered it with the warm colors of his idealism.

Poetry and Chivalry in the Service of the Franciscan School

When we see how the ideals of knighthood influenced St. Francis so profoundly we are forced to make a comparison between him and other founders of Orders who had had a military

[15] Tillemann, *Individualitaet*, p. 222.

Knighthood

career, as St. Benedict and St. Ignatius. A good parallel is the difference between a high-minded knight and a Roman Legionary.[15] The military character of the two other Orders mentioned is noticeable especially in their rigid organization and in their application of obedience with a corresponding rigid training of their members. With Francis organization was never such as to bear any resemblance whatsoever to militarism. Francis, too, knew obedience—literal and unreserved—especially where there was question of fulfilling a command of God, his *Dominus* as expressed in the Gospel. But he never transfered this type of obedience to other domains of asceticism.

Franciscan Order Not Military in Character

It is true, it was St. Francis who spoke of Obedience under the parable of a corpse but the practical application of such obedience is found for the first time in Ignatian asceticism. What Francis adopted from the idea of knighthood was fidelity—joyous, songful fidelity—in the service of the Most High Lord and Lady Poverty; hence the romantic features. It is evident that such a training in a society which was growing apace was not suitable to all characters. Among the brethren were cold, calculating individuals, who, in spite of their great respect for the Founder, found this ascetical playing at knighthood eccentric and visionary. And these were, for the most part, the men whose efforts preserved the Order from dissolution. But it is also undeniably true that the others who allowed their lives and actions to be influenced by this poetry were the ones who made the Order popular by bringing the atmosphere of the *Fioretti* among the people and who, as *Joculatores Domini* and popular preachers found opportunity to impart to men the most highly educational of all truths. Without this mystical tinge the Franciscan idea would never have proved, as it really did, a flood of blessing for Italy and the whole Church. Without this radiantly beautiful mysticism the ideal of Poverty in the Franciscan extreme could never have survived the chilling frost of a wealth-loving world.

3. Examples of Francis' preventive measures were the wars he waged against bad example, which he was wont to punish drastically; against faults contrary to charity, especially slander; and against idleness which he rightly considered the source of many evils. He never stresses work as an end in itself but only

Preventive Measures

as a preventive of idleness. The ideal of begging and the ideal of work always stood more or less as opposites in the Franciscan institute. There can be no doubt as to which ideal was dearer to Francis: Begging was an affair of the heart; work, an affair of the understanding.

Under the present heading we can not avoid mentioning Francis' opposition to learning. He had a suspicion of learning and would have none of it. The reason is not far to seek. The merest glance at conditions existing in the beginning of the thirteenth century suffices. To pursue a course of studies was an impossibility for the son of a peasant or simple citizen unless such a one studied for the Church, in which case a bright future from a material point of view was open to him. He might become a prelate or bishop and thus become *lord* over others who would then serve him almost as slaves. Hence learning threatened holy humility, and simplicity, and these formed the bulwark of the great Franciscan ideal—most high poverty. Francis held with St. Paul that "science puffeth up." Practically all authors, with the exception of Felder, agree that nothing caused Francis greater doubt or misgiving regarding the future of the Order than to see it enter upon the way of learning. The sources are full of instances which will bear no other interpretation. The unflinching idealism of Francis is never more evident than in his use of preventive measures to protect his ideal—Poverty.

Francis' Opposition to Learning

4. Time after time Francis experienced the bitter fact that his ideals were not properly comprehended or were misunderstood. Hence we frequently meet with the use of repression or restraint. To Francis the ideal measure of restraint was not punishment, but exhortation and advice. The office of a superior would be easy indeed if every matter could be settled by a word of exhortation or advice and one could then really govern a community of Friars from a sick bed.

Repression and Restraint

But more than once Francis was forced to resort to punishment. To us of the twentieth century the penances he imposed appear somewhat drastic, but measured by the standards of the Middle

Punishment

Ages they are really mild. In inflicting punishment Francis never sought anything but the betterment of those concerned, for he was aware of the word of God "Revenge is mine." The sources, especially from the time immediately preceding Francis' resignation as official head of the Order, offer many examples of sharp reprimands as well as of severe punishments, the pedagogical value of which was increased by the loving words of exhortation which precede or follow. Well-known examples are: the case of the Friar who was obliged to take off his habit and appear before the people in his underclothing to confess that he had given bad example; the expulsion of the Friar who would neither work nor beg and who desired an easy life; Francis' action in regard to the house of studies at Bologna, etc.

A letter which Francis wrote in 1223 to "A Minister" deals with the problem of punishment. The whole letter breathes Franciscan charity. Since at this time the *Regula bullata* had already been composed, at least in outline, the letter does not speak of any punishment in particular but only of the spirit which must guide the superior who punishes. It must be the spirit of the Good Shepherd, solicitous for the sheep. Especially beautiful and pedagogically correct is the advice to superiors to bear no grudge or show any coldness after an understanding has been reached with an erring brother. If a superior must punish he shall do so charitably and kindly. Above all Francis would warn the superiors of his Order against being "carnifex ad puniendum et flagellandum sicut potestates hujus saeculi." After his resignation, Francis, grievously ill, left to others the difficult task of governing. He confined his activity to stressing motives and ideals and to good example. Moreover, the official Rule had already determined the procedure to be followed in inflicting punishment.

Francis' Advice on Punishment

Upon his return from the Orient, Francis found his highest ideals in grave danger. What was to be done against the rising flood? In the first place Francis himself tried to take hold. The most severe punishments which the educational system of Francis knew were employed, but did not serve to restore the old fidelity to Poverty. The house at Bologna was listed as

Francis' Ideals in Danger

"not belonging to the Friars," because it was remembered that years before Francis had been satisfied when he heard that the Chapter House at Assisi did not belong to the Friars.

But the new spirit was entirely foreign to the ill Founder. Peter Staccia remained impenitent. The whole ideal was at stake. Then Francis realized that, alone, he could not ward off impending disaster. He therefore went to the Pope and asked him to appoint a Cardinal as protector of the Order. In the same year the Institute was formally erected into a religious Order by the Bull *Cum Secundum Consilium* of Honorius III.

Francis Gives His Order to the Church

By this step Francis turned his foundation over to the Church. Wittingly and willingly Francis had thereby applied a principle which in its results has been more far-reaching than many of his other pedagogical principles. Francis was "subditus et subjectus pedibus ejusdem sanctae ecclesiae." And herein lies any justification that may be needed for the Order today. For with all of our love and reverence for St. Francis, the Church means immensely more to us, and she has made the Order what it is today. Our Order is the child of St. Francis raised to maturity by our Mother the Church. And this must be borne in mind when contrasting the Order of the thirteenth and the twentieth century.

Francis of Assisi is not a mere pedagogue. He has no carefully and consciously planned aims in his educational work; but he is an educator none the less, a trainer of souls with the method of a genius. The direction which the Franciscan school took with its development of Augustinian teaching into a system, can be traced back to the spirit of the Founder. The position of the Franciscans in Scholasticism is not merely accidental. Their teaching, especially on the primacy of the will, is a direct result of the bent which Francis had given. The thirteenth century which borrowed from Aristotle the forms of philosophy to give accuracy and precision to theology, also held Plato in esteem. Soon the school of the Dominicans and that of the Franciscans, or Thomism and Scotism as they were also known from their great leaders, came to be looked upon as being antithetical. While the Dominicans formed their world-view on Aristotelian foundations, the Francis-

Francis' Method That of a Genius

His Influence on Franciscan School of Thought

cans drew on Augustine and Anselm and thus naturally leaned more toward Platonism. This difference gave rise to the controversy regarding the relationship of intellect and will, a controversy first brought to a head by Anselm and Abelard, but which had continued to grow in vehemence. In the disputations of the times the question was whether the more noble faculty was the will or the intellect, and accordingly as the answer was given a disputant was marked as a disciple of one of the two schools. The Dominicans, faithful to their Aristotelian tendencies, proclaimed the primacy of the intellect, while the Franciscans, holding fast to Augustinian tradition, assigned the primacy to the will. It is not mere fancy which leads us to see in the position of the Franciscan school the influence of the strong-willed Francis, his stressing of the importance of the will in his educational program, or, in other words, the primacy of the will in the first school of the Blessed Francis.

Teachings of Franciscan School Due to Francis' Training

Francis' influence is likewise discernable in the concept of God as found in the Franciscan system. God is will and love. The sovereignty of God's will, modified by His all-embracing love; idealism as a speculative system with the doctrine of the *illuminatio divina intellectus agentis;* the doctrine of the objective existence of universals; and finally the concept elaborated by Alexander of Hales that eternal beatitude does not consist in the intellectual contemplation and knowledge of God, but in the surrender of the human will to the divine and a union with God by love—all these tenets of the Franciscan school were foreshadowed by the direction which Francis gave to the training of his disciples. Francis' own concept of God, his unconditional surrender of his will, his attitude towards creatures, his process of rising from the love of God to the contemplation of God, his great love of God coloring the universe for him, his finding of happiness in a will purified and detached from all that is earthly—all point to a parallel doctrine in the later scientifically elaborated system of the Franciscan school.

Men who lived and had learned to think in the heyday of scholasticism were in a position to form their own world-view and to choose between Augustinianism and the newly resurrected Aristotelianism. How was it then that men found themselves together

wearing the garb of the Poverello and at the same time were adherents of the same school of thought? It was not mere accident that they wore the same garb and neither was it accident that they upheld the same doctrine. There is a twofold possibility: either they were men who had entered the Order after completing their studies, as Alexander of Hales, or they made their studies in the Order. In the first case we see how one whose philosophical leanings were the same as those of the Franciscan school, found in the Order a correspondingly appealing system of asceticism. In the other case we see how those educated in the spirit of Franciscan ideas and influenced from youth by Franciscan asceticism naturally when left to choose a system of thought would lean towards a system embodying their ascetical ideas. The tolerance, adaptability, independence and doctrine of the primacy of the will which characterize the Franciscan school of philosophical thought, characterized Franciscan asceticism from its beginning.

Relationship Between the System of Thought and Asceticism

If we, of the twentieth century, hold fast to these same great and warm principles of education, we too, are *Franciscan* educators, and a glance at the ideals so enthusiastically advocated by modern pedagogy will show us that we are also *modern* educators,—true children of the "Modern Saint."

Conclusion

DISCUSSION

EDWIN DORZWEILER, O.M.Cap.:—If it is an objective of education to spread the knowledge of worthy ideals and teach men how to exemplify them in their daily lives, then St. Francis should be numbered among the world's foremost educators. His program of education was as simple as the Gospel and as deep. And any one who is successful in making the Gospel the rule of life for the many is an educator.

St. Francis an Educator

Francis taught men the hidden charms of poverty. He showed them that poverty was not at all the hateful thing that it was commonly regarded to be. Much of its ill repute came from the false constructions that were put upon the values of life. Happiness was not to be looked upon as the privilege of the rich; it dwelled also in the hovels of the poor. In the frantic endeavor to amass material things and to forfend the possibility of poverty, men lose that quiet of mind which is so essential to human enjoyment. William James scored the unreasonable dread of poverty when he said: "Among us English-speaking peoples especially do the praises of poverty need once more to be boldly sung. We have grown literally afraid to be poor. We despise any one who elects to be poor to simplify and save his inner life. If he does not join the general scramble and pant with the money-making street, we deem him spiritless and lacking in ambition. It is time

for thinking men to protest against so unmanly and irreligious a state of affairs. The prevalent fear of poverty among the educated classes is the worst moral disease from which our civilization suffers." The praises of poverty were never more boldly sung than by the Poverello of Assisi. And his love for Lady Poverty became contagious. People flocked to him and imitated him and learned to enrich their lives with the contentment and happiness of Franciscan poverty.

Francis was also a past master in teaching the art of artlessness. Simplicity was for him the companion of poverty and the daughter of truth. Like all great souls, he eschewed artificiality and display. His every word and action revealed the simple grandeur of his noble character. Simplicity, he knew, removes the barrier between man and man and paves the way for pleasant association. Franciscan simplicity has been the theme of the poet and the artist these seven centuries. It still lives on in Franciscan monasteries where it has found a home and is cherished as a precious legacy.

An intelligent understanding and an appealing character are recognized requirements of an educator. Francis possessed these in a marked degree. His was a keen analysis of the needs of his time. What had escaped the understanding of the learned in high places was clear to him. Plainly the thirteenth century needed a solvent for the materialistic incrustations that had formed on the body of the Church, and a revitalizing spirit to insure the fervor and strength of pristine Christianity. Francis saw all this and, what is more, provided the remedy. No less discerning was his psychological understanding of his confrères. No distress of soul came to them but he noticed it; no emotional disturbance but he could set it aright. Paired with it all was his ready, cheerful sympathy that found its way into every heart and inspired unwavering confidence. Such favorable accomplishments are the unmistakable birthright of the educator.

THEODOSIUS FOLEY, O.M.Cap.:—I am very glad that the question as to the attitude of St. Francis toward learning has been touched upon. There seems to be quite some misunderstanding about this attitude. The writings of St. Francis, if read without their historical background or without attention to facts in the life of the Saint himself or ignoring his passionate attachment to, and obedience towards, Holy Church, seem to convey the impression that their author is opposed to learning as a field of activity in his Order.

Any ordinary student of history, however, will be able to grasp what, in the light of contemporary conditions, kind of learning St. Francis was adverse to. He did not favor empty dialecties, or bombastic rhetoric, or idle hair-splittings of the schools. He forbade learning as such for the lay-brothers. For the clerics, however, he himself appointed St. Antony as first lector of the Order, realizing that the priesthood demands study as a duty of its state in life, just as the brotherhood requires manual labor. *Sentire cum ecclesia* was the keynote of St. Francis' character and as such we can easily picture St. Francis today, if he were alive, vying with the first in obedience to Holy Church in the matter of learning for his clerics. The history of the Order from St. Bonaventure down to the present day vouches for the fact that sacred learning in the service of the Church is just as legitimate a field of labor for the Friars as preaching or missionary work.

Coming down to the present we find the Order engaged in many activities which are the result of local needs of the Church but which specifically were not in the mind of the Seraphic Lawgiver when he indited his Rule. For

Educational Activity of the Friars

instance, parish work. One can with more justice argue that parish work in itself is less conformable to the genius of the Franciscan apostolate and to the structure of religious life than teaching. The demands of a parish on the individual Friars engaged in it and on the community attached to it interfere more seriously with strict regular observance than those of a house of learning. The greatest problem facing religious today is how to regulate the demands of the ministry in a parish and those of religious life. Both cannot be upheld in their entirety and do justice to each without sacrificing the health and happiness of such victims of a double calling. If on the one hand the Bishop and the parish require that the religious pastor and assistants give as much attention (and in their case, often more, because of a higher consecration) to parochial activities as a secular priest, and on the other hand the religious superiors, as they are by oath bound, insist on regular observance of choir and monastic practices, what will be the outcome? Prudent superiors must see to it that certain relaxations from Rule or ceremonial be made to meet the situation. Eventually as the parish activities in our modern world increase, dispensations are asked, and so, the individual conscientious religious pastor or assistants, ask themselves: Am I really keeping what I vowed to observe in my religious profession?

Neither the individual religious nor the Order as such is to be condemned because of this. Nor is parochial work to be looked down upon as something extraneous to our calling. It is always the *cura animarum*. Even though St. Francis at his time accepted such care of souls in a general way as part of his campaign, if the interests of Holy Church in the course of centuries localizes this *cura animarum* into parochial work in certain parts of the Order, can any one condemn the spirit of the Order imbibed from its Founder in coming to the aid of souls because it is not specifically contained in the letter of the Rule?

Conceding this, however, cannot we demand that, *a majori*, teaching and studies being in themselves more conformable to Rule, and hence are more in conformity with our ideals and history than parochial work?

Experience in any Province of the Order will bear out the assertion that houses of study are always houses of observance. With the possible exception of those engaged as prefects, all teachers are free to follow the daily practices of the community, and these are kept at top notch just because of the nature of a house of study where the young candidates of the Order are expected to imbibe the spirit and life of the Order at its fountainhead.

So I contend that learning is a real Franciscan activity growing out of the great missionary work of the Order and, if not mentioned expressly in the Rule, is surely in the spirit of St. Francis, as his actions proclaim and his personality as an obedient son of Holy Church argues. It is further borne out by his best and holiest expositors, by the history of the Order and by its adaptability to our profession as religious.

ANSCAR ZAWART, O.M.Cap.:—The influence of St. Francis on education has been well described by Fr. Robert. What must, however, strike one as strange is, how Francis' pedagogical method may at all be appraised by divorcing him from, or placing him in opposition to, learning. It should not be so difficult on the basis of the 'sources' to conceive Francis as in perfect sympathy with science and with men of learning without doing violence either to his idealism or to history. Hilarin Felder[1] is not alone in his

[1] *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Studien im Franziskanerorden*, pp. 58 ff.

defense of Francis in that position. We find the same attitude taken by Ehrle,[2] Holzapfel[3]; in the splendid Lives of St. Francis by Christen,[4] Joergensen,[5] Schnuerer,[6] Cuthbert[7]; by such scholars as Goerres,[8] Robinson,[9] Hilaire de Barenton[10] and P. Gratien.[11] In his latest work[12] Felder is hesitant as to whether or not to declare Francis sympathetic even with profane science. This last contention, it seems to me, can be established. The 'sancta humilitas et simplicitas' and the great Franciscan ideal, 'altissima paupertas,' will not be threatened, if only the spirit of Francis is correctly understood and interpreted.

Interpretation of 'Sources'

I have not the slightest intention to force an interpretation favorable to my claim. But I do maintain that Sabatier, the real mischief maker in this matter, has forced an interpretation conformable to his *a priori* assumptions. In his *Vie de St-François d'Assise* (pp. 318-320) Sabatier states that Francis feared that his brethren would become untrue to holy poverty and humility; but what he feared yet more than the temptation of riches was the devil of learning.[13] Sabatier is a Protestant, and in his Protestant way he twists words and sayings from their context—a familiar process of so-called Higher Criticism. Instead of interpreting texts in the light of the author's other sayings and writings, he distorts them in a way as to put down the very contrary of the author's mind. But what may not be expected from a skeptic who states as a principle that there is no such thing as objective history, that to write it "we must think it, and to think it is to transform it" after one's own subjective ideas, that, in fact, enthusiasm and "being in love" with one's subject yields the most reliable history irrespective of the fetters which documents, proofs and history impose.[14] Had Sabatier but loved more! He has succeeded in leading astray only one Catholic author, LeMonnier[15]; then, with his companion-in-arms, Karl

---

[2] *Archiv fuer Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, III (1887), pp. 577 ff.

[3] *Handbuch der Geschichte des Franziskanerordens*, pp. 268 ff.

[4] *Leben des heiligen Franz von Assisi* (3. ed.), p. 292.

[5] *Saint Francis of Assisi* (1913), p. 228.

[6] *Franz von Assisi* (Munich, 1905), pp. 86 ff.

[7] *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*, pp. 350 ff.

[8] *Katholik*, vol. XX.

[9] *The Real St. Francis* (2. ed. 1904), pp. 75 ff.

[10] *Saint François et la Science* (Paris, 1928), passim.

[11] *Histoire de la Fondation et de l'Evolution de l'Ordre des Frères-Mineurs au XIIIe siecle*, Paris, 1928, pp. 83-96. This recent author, however, contends against Felder, that Francis considered learning entirely unnecessary for the realization of the ideal of his Order. Only forced by circumstances did he later permit to students the study of sacred science (theology) with the exclusion of profane learning (classics, philosophy), and then only on condition that it serve as a means to self-sanctification. Cf. also, Gilson, M. E., *La Philosophie de S. Bonaventure*, Paris, 1924, pp. 46 ff.

[12] *Die Ideale des hl. Franziskus* (1923), p. 465.

[13] "Il trouvait ses Frères atteints de deux maladies, infidéles à la fois à la pauvreté et à la l'humilité; mais peut-être redoutait-il plus pour eux le démon de la science que la tentation des richesses."

[14] Pour écrire l'histoire, il faut penser, et la penser, c'est la transformer. . . . C'est donc une utopie que l'histoire objective. Nous creons Dieu à notre image et nous imprimons la marque de notre personnalité, la ou l'on s'attend le moins a la retrouver. . . . L'amour est la véritable clef de l'histoire," l. c. pp. xxv-xxviii.

[15] *Vie de Saint-François*, II ch. XIV, 64.

Mueller,[16] he formulates the specious argument: "Francis is called the 'vir catholicus'; but he was inexorably opposed to science. Therefore, the Church and the Religion of which he was the exponent opposes science." The viciousness of the circle lies therein that the major proposition is not the result of objective history but a subjective notion, call it love if you will, for "l'amour est la véritable clef." Casting about with such phrases, as "who knows," "no doubt," "we may suppose," "does not this suggest," "if not on his lips it was surely in his heart," etc., he brings as minor propositions the 'sources,' which indeed he knows and misinterprets with consummate skill. He overlooks, or at least wishes us to overlook, that the 'sources' speak of Francis' strong opposition to *false* science, to *treacherous* science, to a science that "puffeth up" and leads away from God, a hankering after learning by the weak, the unlearned, the undisciplined, whom learning instead of benefiting would seriously harm.

Learning Required in the 13th Century

In the 13th century the Church insisted on the proper amount of study for those who wished to exercise the office of preaching. That amount, however, was very moderate. Even the Order of Preachers, the 'ordo studens' *par excellence*, demanded but three years of study for its *Praedicatores generales*, while the ordinary preachers were admitted to the office after one year.[17] The Friars Minor certainly demanded no more. The schools of the West of that period had no place for philosophy. Physicians, jurists, theologians were expected to have finished grammar, i. e., the Latin language, and have some smattering of logics.[18] The *Organon* of Aristotle had become known but recently, while his Physics and Metaphysics as well as the natural sciences were introduced only in the first quarter of the 13th century. By all judicious minds, not only by Francis, these new branches of learning, the nature of which was not sufficiently explored, were viewed with some alarm and suspicion. Francis was obliged to oppose them, because, since the year 1210, the Church had repeatedly issued official warnings to the faculty of arts at Paris against an indiscriminate use of the translations from Aristotle, whilst to others the works of Aristotle were positively forbidden.[19] Francis' attitude, then, resolves itself into this: whatever learning, whether it went under the name of theology or worldly science, was conducive to turning the mind to God or increasing the love of God, Francis advocated; whatever distracted souls and turned them away from the spirit of holy prayer and devotion he stamped as "modus studendi vanus et curiosus." Hence not science as such was the object of Francis' solicitude or alarm, but the good or bad use that was made of learning. Of this the 'sources' give unmistakable evidence.

Francis Approves Learning

It is well known that Francis had the habit of collecting bits of paper, thinking that the name of God or something pertaining to divine subjects might be written there. One day, while he was busy with a bundle of papers containing classic verses a Friar said to him that surely these pagan writings bore no reference to God. Francis answered: "This writing belongs neither to the pagans nor to any group of men, but to God from whom comes every good; for on these papers are the letters of which the name of God is composed."[20] His conclusions are evident. All literature, religious or pro-

---

[16] *Die Anfaenge des Minoritenordens*, p. 104.

[17] Denifle, "Die Constitutionen des Predigerordens" in *Archiv f. Lit. u. Kircheng. d. M. A.*, I, 223.

[18] See *Report of Franc. Educ. Conf.*, 1928, pp. 77 ff.

[19] *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* ed. Denifle-Chatelain, I, pp. 70, 114, 138, 143.

[20] Thomas of Celano, I, 82, in *Analecta Franciscana*, X 61.

fane, presents to us the name of God and allows us to study Him; all literature, even the ancient classic, contains in it some vestige of truth and goodness. This truth and this goodness come from God and, properly employed, are converted into His glory.

A quite similar incident is related by St. Bonaventure.[21] The Friars were eager to study the Scriptures (i. e., Sacred Theology), but there were no books. When finally one copy of the New Testament was found, Francis separated the leaves and gave to each Friar a section, so that all could study and, nevertheless, one would not disturb the other. In those days books constituted a veritable treasure; but in Francis' opinion learning was a still greater treasure, for which reason he was willing to sacrifice the former to serve the latter.

The same Bonaventure shows how the most high poverty is safeguarded despite books and study. The Rule, he says, enjoins preaching as a strict duty. In order not to relate myths but God's Word, one must study. But how can one study without books? Preaching and books, therefore, are inseparable, just as one must have missals and breviaries for the liturgical readings.[22] The *Legend of the Three Companions* (ch. XI) and Ubertino of Casale,[23] both severe interpreters of the law of poverty, speak of the necessity of libraries in view of preaching, but insist that the books are for common and not for personal use. All books necessary for preaching were permitted; luxury in bindings and superfluity was interdicted. The conclusion is logical that Francis expected his Friars to study in view of preaching, a fact so evident to St. Bonaventure that he glories in Francis having been the first to prescribe study and preaching.[24] One may go so far as to say that Francis founded a school for the younger members of the Order. For what else is the commission to St. Antony to teach theology, than the setting up of a school and the outlining a course of studies?[25] But since this letter clearly sets forth the author's advocacy of learning, Sabatier finds no other way out of the difficulty than to deny its authenticity.[26]

Again, the esteem in which Francis held the possessors and dispensers of learning is an indirect but none the less convincing proof of his endorsement of study and science. Preachers who are necessarily engaged in study, he says, should not be disturbed by other offices and occupations, while the doctors of theology must be treated with special honor (*amplioribus honoribus*). In his letters to the first Lector of the Order he wrote to him as to "Fratri Antonio, episcopo meo."[27] Peter Cataneo, the former lawyer and a master in jurisprudence (*vir litteratus, iuris peritus et dominus legum*) was treated by Francis with marked respect, and for the very reason of his great learning was addressed by him as "Lord."[28] Likewise Francis insisted that everyone be met with the respect

Francis Honors Learned Men

---

[21] *Epistola de Tribus Quaestionibus*, n. 10, *Op. omn.*, VIII, 334.

[22] *L. c.*, n. 6.

[23] Ehrle in *Archiv f. Lit. u. Kircheng.*, II, pp. 353 ff.

[24] "Clamat Regula expresse imponens . . . officium, quod non credo in aliqua Regula alia reperiri." *De Tribus Quaestionibus*, n. 6. l. c. VIII, 333.

[25] "Carissimo meo fratri Antonio frater Franciscus salutem in Christo. Placet mihi, quod sacram theologiam legas fratribus, dummodo propter huiusmodi studium sanctae orationis et devotionis spiritum non extinguant, sicut in Regula continetur. Vale." Chron. XXIV, Generalium, in *Anal. Franciscana*, III, 132.

[26] *Vie de St. François*, p. 322.

[27] Celano, II, n. 163, in *Analecta Franciscana*, X, 224.

[28] "Quia frater Petrus vir litteratus erat et nobilis, beatus Franciscus

that was his due, and of all classes the learned men (viri litterati) were to be honored most.[29] The sentiments of the *Testament* are practically identical with the lettered and unlettered Friars: two classes are represented in the Order, though in the early days the unlettered were greatly in the majority. By reason of their numbers Francis feared that the unlettered would crowd the others to the wall and hence, in the form of an ingenious parable recommended to them peace and unity.[30] He himself must be considered as belonging to the lettered or learned brethren; else, as St. Bonaventure points out, Francis transgressed his own Rule, for he was ever eager to study and educate himself and exercise the prodigious memory wherewith he was gifted.[31] The products of his pen are favorably known: some thirty sermons or conferences, formulas of prayers, splendid poems, open letters to all Christians, to prelates and clerics, to religious numerous admonitions and epigrams. Thus Francis was the first writer of his Order and, if one may say so, the first apostle of the press, for he commanded that his writings be multiplied and spread broadcast for the benefit of others.[32]

House of Study at Bologna

There remains, however, the unpleasant episode regarding the large house, or convent, in Bologna, in 1219 (or in 1220). The following facts seem certain. Previous to that time the brethren had nowhere inhabited a building permanently or one that they might call their own. But after the Friars had been living in Bologna for seven years, Peter of Staccia, the Minister Provincial and formerly professor at Bologna, had established a rather commodious home in conformity with the practice of other religious orders; on his return from Egypt, Francis had the entire community evicted, pronouncing at the same time a curse on Peter of Staccia for attempting to wreck his foundation. Nowhere in the account of Angelus of Clareno[33] or in the *Vitae* of Celano is there any mention of learning or studies, and hence it was not these that were so severely censured. St. Bonaventure adduces the real reason for the founder's indignation, namely, that Peter of Staccia, altogether *contrary to the clear words of the Rule* had acquired and appropriated a large house for the brethren.[34] It was not until Cardinal Hugolino publicly stated in a sermon that said house was *his* property and not the property of the Friars Minor, that Francis permitted his brethren to return to the convent.[35] His ill will cannot have been directed against studies, for he himself had inaugurated the studies in the very city of Bologna by his appointment of Antony of Padua as Lector. The study houses of Paris and Oxford, too, were opened if not upon his bidding surely with his consent.

A second statement of Francis in this connection is exploited against him.

---

propter suam urbanitatem ipsum honorando dominum appellavit." *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, ed. Boehmer n. 12, p. 12. Cf. n. 11, p. 9.

[29] Celano, I, n. 57, in *Anal. Franc.*, X, 43.

[30] Celano, II, nn. 191, 192, 193, in *Anal. Franc.*, X, 239 ss.

[31] *Ep. de Trib. Quaest.* n. 10, Op. omn. VIII, 334; *Expos. super Regul.* c. X, n. 6, *ibid.*, 433; Celano, II, n. 102, in *Anal. Franc.*, X, 190.

[32] Cf. *Opuscoli di S. Francesco* da un Capuccino (Latin and Italian text), Firenze, 1880, pp. xii-568; Ubald d'Alençon, *Les Opuscules de S. François*, Paris, 1905, pp. vii-286; Paschal Robinson, *The Writings of St. Francis of Assisi*, Philadelphia, 1906, pp. xxxii-208.

[33] *Historia septem tribulationum*, published by Ehrle in *Archiv. f. Lit. u. Kirchg.*, II, pp. 249-336, *Tribulatio prima.*

[34] *Legenda S. Francisci*, c. VII, n. 2, in *Op. omn.*, VIII, 523. *Regula* c. VI: "Fratres nihil sibi approprient, *nec domum*, nec locum, nec aliquam rem."

[35] Celano, II, 58, in *Anal. Franc.*, X, 166.

According to the *Actus sancti Francisci* (c. 61), which were composed a century later (1322-28), Francis is said to have told Peter of Staccia: "Desiderabam et volebam, exemplo Domini mei Jesu Christi, fratres meos *magis* orare quam legere." At once Sabatier [36] is at hand with the rendering that Francis wished his brethren *rather* to pray than to study or, in other words, he wished them to pray and *not* to study. No, what Francis forbade was exaggerated study, such avidity and intensity in study as to redound to the loss and detriment of prayer and devotion. As for the example of Christ, Francis knew and we know, that He *taught* in the synagogues, that it was His custom to repair to the synagogue on the Sabbath to *teach*, that He *read* and explained Isaias to His hearers. Christ explained the Bible, which was the sum total of Jewish learning, containing as it does, not only the dogmatic teachings but the morals, liturgical customs, general and national history, the sciences, music and literature of the Jews, hence a universal encyclopedia of knowledge.

In the opinion of Francis all brethren must labor, the students at study, the laybrothers at manual work, but each must watch not to engage in labor to such an extent as to extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion.[37] Never should the brethren yield to the temptation of striving after *frivolous* science, nor *passionately* acquire mere booklearning, because thus many a one, while thinking to edify others (by preaching) is liable to lose his vocation, "namely holy humility and simplicity, prayer and devotion and our Lady Poverty." [38] Celano [39] expresses the same thought when he says of Francis that he wished his brethren "to seek in books the testimony of the Lord (Ps. 18, 8) and not earthly value, edification not beauty of diction"; and when he told the Minister who asked license to retain a number of books, that he was entirely unwilling to lose his Book of the Gospels for the sake of his (the Minister's) books or grant a license which might become a snare (Ps. 68, 23). Francis had indeed encountered the sad experience of such Friars as grew puffed up, conceited and arrogant because of their preaching and learning, and he had to warn constantly against passionate, frivolous, vain and false learning.[40] It is against these defects and dangers in study that he inveighs, not against learning as such nor against legitimate study. For noble science, no matter of what nature, philosophy or theology, when humbly pursued "gradually leads the mind from the consideration of the creature to the consideration of the Creator." [41] Of this process, namely, to turn all knowledge, no matter how gained, to God, Francis is the most convincing representative. His foremost sons, too, such as Alexander of Hales, Antony, Bonaventure, Adam Marsh, John of la Rochelle, John of Parma, Duns Scotus and a host of others prove that solid learning is indeed compatible with the spirit of holy prayer and devotion. They further show that holy humility and simplicity as well as their foundation, most high poverty, need fear no infringement or extinction,

Opposition to Vain Learning

Learning Must Lead to God

---

[36] *Vie de Saint François*, p. xvii. (See Sabatier's edition of *Actus B. Francisci*, Paris, 1902, pp. lxiv-272.)

[37] See Letter to St. Antony, cited above. Also, *Rule*, ch. V: "The Friars shall work faithfully and devotedly, in such wise that avoiding idleness, they yet do not extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion."

[38] *Opuscoli di S. Francesco*, Collatio XVI, l. c., p. 258.

[39] Celano, II, 62, in *Anal. Francisc.*, X, 168.

[40] *Opuscoli*, Collatio XVI, XVII, l. c., pp. 258 s., 262 s.

[41] St. Bonaventure, III *Sent.* xvii, art. ii, q. I ad 3.

when study, science and learning is placed into the hands of men of solidity of character and holiness of life. On the contrary, it was ever the learned class in the Order, the doctors and lectors, that preserved it in religious observance, defended it against enemies and restored the discipline when it commenced to wane. What would the Order of Friars Minor have become without them, what a terrible mistake would Francis have made to have opposed devout learning and truly learned men?

The contributions of Francis to science or to sound Christian education may be summarized as follows:

1. Francis loved science and greatly honored learned men.
2. Francis did not love science to the extent of idolizing it, for he clearly detected the danger inherent in a false and frivolous science.
3. Francis loved and advocated science when used as a means to lead both teachers and students to God.
4. The pedagogy taught by Saint Francis was put into practice during the thirteenth century by his foremost sons, and produced marvelous fruits.[42]

Voluntarism Versus Intellectualism

CLAUDE MINDORFF, O.F.M.:—In the paper of Fr. Robert Hammer, just read to the Conference, the author seems to stress unduly the influence of St. Francis upon the philosophical question of free-will and its superiority to the intellect.

If the doctrine of St. Thomas and of Ven. Duns Scotus were stated in the same terminology, I firmly believe that no essential difference would be found in their respective opinions on the nature of the free-will. St. Thomas, with Scotus, holds that the essential difference between human actions and those of the brute creation is that man can control his action and determine himself thereto, whereas brute creation cannot do this, for it is already determined by its nature and object to its particular acts.

On the other hand, man's indetermination, according to St. Thomas, has different degrees or species. St. Thomas distinguishes three kinds of indetermination: 1) in regard to end and means; 2) in reference to good and evil; and 3) in acting and non-acting. Our ultimate end is determined; and our will, *ut natura*, is inclined to that end; but our will, *ut agens liberum*, is not determined in its choice of means to that end. Again, as the object of the will is the good, it is apparent that the will is determined to the good, and cannot tend towards the evil as such. In reference to acting or not-acting, St. Thomas states expressly (*QQ. Disp. de Verit.*, XXII, a. 6, inc.): "Inest libertas voluntati in quolibet statu naturae respectu cuiuslibet obiecti."

There is nothing in all this, which is *essentially* opposed to the doctrine of Scotus. Scotus merely goes a step farther and places the essence of liberty, not in a negative quality of being indetermined, but in the positive power of self-determination. He explains, that the determination of the will to its ultimate end, as well as its determination to the good as its object, are determinations of the will as nature, and therefore refer to the *actus primus*, or being of the will. *Voluntas, ut libera*, however, is essentially free in every one of its *actus secundi*, and it is that, independently of accidental circumstances, that may limit the field of its object. According to Scotus the will is just as essentially free in one action as in another, just as free towards one object as to another, since the essence of freedom consists in the power

---

[42] Cf. *Saint François et la Science*, by Hilaire de Barenton, O.M.Cap., Paris (4, Rue Cassette), 1928, p. 46.

of the will to determine itself to action. Naturally, this power of self-determination supposes or includes the indetermination to act or not-act, as described by St. Thomas. Thus, if we accept liberty in this essential meaning, its extension will be practically the same in the doctrine of St. Thomas and that of Scotus.

Likewise in the question of superiority of will or intellect, the above-mentioned authors use different terminology, or different criteria, or make different distinctions, so that naturally their conclusions read differently; but their difference was never so great, as was developed later on in the petty discussions of the Thomistic and Scotistic schools.

St. Francis, however, cannot be said to have influenced this doctrinal difference in any appreciable manner. He was an ascetic and a mystic, but not a philosopher, and no author of note can be found who based a single philosophical doctrine on the authority of St. Francis. The origin and factors of voluntarism as opposed to intellectualism, are to be sought in the philosophical systems themselves, beginning with Plato and Aristotle, but can hardly find their sufficient explanation in the ascetical field.

The Influence of St. Francis on Philosophy

SIMON JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT, O.F.M.:—However paradoxical it may appear, Etienne Gilson, in his essay *St. François et la Pensée Médiévale*, proves that St. Francis has inspired a whole philosophy. No one denies his influence upon the artists. But how is it possible for a man who ignores speculative thought and philosophy, to beget a system of dialectic and a philosophy of his own? St. Francis, it is true, has never philosophized in the speculative sense of the word, but he has lived: he has given to the world a life, and an example. It will not surprise us, therefore, that the philosophers and savants, conscious of his memory, inflamed by his examples, have looked up to him as the subject of their meditations; have constructed and coördinated his lessons into a genuine doctrine which acted as a leaven upon the mediaeval thought. If an historian ignores this influence, he will never understand the Franciscan aspects of the traditional doctrine.

The cross is the living synthesis of the science of St. Francis. Open the ponderous folios of St. Bonaventure, summarize the extensive and exhaustive developments of the Doctor in a few capital theses, condense these theses and reduce them to one image, as it were: the first offspring of the unique and ineffable intuition of the entire development; what will be the result? A perfect agreement between the teaching of the Gospel, St. Paul, St. Augustine and the examples of St. Francis. "Christ is the center of all beings: He is the starting point of all Christian knowledge and wisdom," says St. Bonaventure. St. Francis has never written a single line of philosophy. Had he done so, it is exactly the one that would have come first; and whoever claims to follow the ideal of the Saint in its primitive purity must so begin.

"But how could this ideal be possibly developed into a system and be realized as such?" asks Mr. Gilson. At first sight the problem seems insoluble. Nevertheless the Franciscan thought has found in it two solutions. Both St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus are faithful to the Franciscan philosophy. Gilson bases this conclusion on a few typical examples. The former is more intuitive, the latter more speculative; the one is laden with "the charming symbols so congenial to the Latin imagination of St. Bonaventure," the other is more didactic, more doctrinal; but both doctrines draw upon the spiritual life of St. Francis.

Gilson, moreover, points out clearly and evidently the common chain which binds the two doctrines, apparently different, to the person of St. Francis.

In spite of their differences the two Doctors are authentically Franciscan. But the interior life of St. Francis was too deep to be drained by two philosophies. While St. Bonaventure attached himself to the mystical character of the Saint, and Duns Scotus to his burning heart, two other doctrines, that of Roger Bacon and that of Raymond Lully bore out to evidence the apostolic signification of his life. Thus we can group around the same personality four systems, exceedingly different, yet fraternally similar.

To summarize: if St. Francis had never existed would these four great philosophers of the Middle Ages have been what they were? Gilson answers unhesitatingly, no! If they differ, the explanation can be found nowhere else but in the person and life of St. Francis himself. He was too richly endowed with accumulated and diversified experiences to be completely exhausted by one doctrinal synthesis. It required the genial efforts of four philosophers to think out all that the life of St. Francis meant. Yet each one has expressed the same religious experience. Beyond Plato and St. Augustine the example of St. Francis guided their thought.

Father Ephrem Longpré has expressed the same views in his Canadian Conferences.

ANSCAR ZAWART, O.M.Cap.:—How far reaching was the influence wielded by the Friars in educational matters even in the 13th century may be seen from the work accomplished by Guibert (Gilbert, Gisbert) of Tournai (d. 1270). Guibert is a little known Friar, yet he exercised a profound influence on the education and educational system of his age, and this to an extent as to touch practically all classes of society. He was a contemporary of St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), of the celebrated Franciscan preachers, Hugh of Digne (d. ca. 1256) and Eudes of Rigauld (d. 1275), later Archbishop of Rouen, but is known more especially because of his familiar relations with Saint Louis IX (d. 1270) and the court of France. He acted as lector in a number of *studia* of the Order and, in the last years of his life, also at Paris. Because of his sound theories on public matters he was requested by Bishop William of Orleans (d. 1258) to compose the *Tractatus de officio Episcopi*, a work of forty-eight chapters giving wholesome advice to bishops how best to conduct themselves in their office and retain the affection and loyalty of clergy and flock.[1] Like the Bishop of Orleans, so Pope Alexander IV (d. 1261), having heard of the extraordinary sermons of Guibert to the clergy of Paris, asked that these be multiplied and published. They are the *Sermones festivi*, seventy-two in number and published at Paris in 1518. Encouraged by the general adoption of the principles therein set forth and requested by bishops and priests, Guibert composed *Sermones ad status*, printed at Louvain, 1473 (1482?) and Paris, 1513. Their purpose was to supply methods of education for states of life that had been overlooked in the works of Jaques de Vitry (d. 1241) and Humbert de Romanis (d. 1277), such as "the lovers of solitude," "inhabitants of cities," "municipal officials," "pupils in elementary schools," etc. The merit of these educational treatises does not lie "in the purity of diction and vivid illustration"[2] but in the deft manner of recognizing educational needs and prescribing remedies. As a matter of fact, Guibert's style does not attain the purity and vividness of the above-mentioned Jaques and Humbert; he is very prolix, indeed, so much so that in one manuscript the copyist, undoubtedly both vexed and tired, wrote desperately on the

Guibert of Tournai

Sermones ad Status

---

[1] *Bibl. Patrum*, Colon. 1618, t. XIII, 395; Lugdun, 1777, t. XXV, 401.

[2] Braunmueller, O.S.B., in *Kirchenlexikon*, V, 1354.

margin: "Date vinum scriptori."[3] However, the contents are so excellent, that Pope Benedict XIV repeatedly refers to the works of Guibert of Tournai. A work similar in scope is his *De pace et tranquillitate animi*, written for Maria Dampetra, a Cistercian nun who was the daughter of the Countess of Flanders and Hanover.

Regula Regum

In the year 1261, Pope Urban IV invited St. Bonaventure from Paris to Orvieto to discuss with him ways and means of organizing a crusade. Guibert of Tournai was the foremost preacher and organizer of the Crusade. As stated above, he was on terms of familiarity with St. Louis, and in his *Hodoepericon*[4] he describes the King's first expedition to, and subsequent imprisonment in, the Holy Land. It was during these years that, perhaps upon request of Louis, the famous crusade preacher wrote his *Regula regum seu de eruditione regum*. The work seems to be extant in only a few manuscripts; it was never printed. In consequence of it, however, Louis introduced in France a great number of changes, especially in regard to wars and judicial trials. Thus, *e. g.*, the right of conquest and private retaliation (*lex talionis*) was almost entirely abolished; judicial duelling was prohibited, and trial by witnesses and attorneys of defense was introduced instead; appeals from local or baronial courts to the royal court were made possible and thus the royal power was greatly strengthened; likewise there were established in the realm citizens' and trades' unions or leagues. With results as these, who would deny that Guibert of Tournai greatly influenced the educational ideas and methods of his day?

Father Girard: Franciscan Educator

ANDREW MAAS, O.M.C.:—It is a far cry from the thirteenth century to the nineteenth. Yet in the latter century we witness the work of a Friar educator that may well be compared with the activities of Guibert of Tournai.

Jean Baptiste Girard was born December 17, 1765, at Fribourg, Switzerland. Even as a lad of tender years Jean Baptiste was obliged to assist his mother in the instruction of his younger sisters, and thus obtained his first experience in education. When sixteen years old he entered the novitiate of the Franciscan Fathers, Friar Minor Conventual, at Lucerne, and received the name of Gregory. He studied philosophy at Offenburg and theology at Würzburg. The decadent theology of the times undermined his faith, but he found new support in the study of the Gospels. Returning to Fribourg, Girard was ordained to the priesthood in 1789. He became acquainted with the liberal canons Fontaine and Pierre d'Appenthal, and read with them the works of Rousseau. While professor of the clerics of the Order he studied the writings of Kant. In 1798 he sent to Ph. A. Stapfer, the Minister of Arts and Sciences of the Swiss Republic, a *Projet d'éducation publique pour la Republique helvétique*, and was summoned by him to Lucerne, where he was active in the Department of Instruction from the end of February to the middle of April, 1799. However, repelled by the then prevailing spirit of anti-religion, he returned to Fribourg. The Swiss board of Directors in 1799 called him to Bern to act as the first Catholic Pastor since the Reformation. He worked here with good results. In 1804 the City Council of Fribourg committed the primary schools to the charge of the Franciscans; and Girard was made Superintendent of Schools. In consequence he worked ardently for the spiritual welfare of the city and neighborhood and took part in the creation of public and literary institutions.

---

[3] Lecoy, *La Chaire Francaise*, p. 149.
[4] *Arch. Franc. Hist.*, X (1917), p. 334.

His principal field of labor, however, was the school, which from 1804 to 1823 he conducted entirely according to his own original plan. In 1801 he visited Pestalozzi in Burgdorf, and in 1809, authorized by the Swiss Diet, he accompanied a commission to Iferten to inspect the institution of Pestalozzi. The commission's report, drawn up by Girard, a valuable methodoligical work, censured Pestalozzi's intricate method of teaching, particularly the mechanization of numbers. Girard's criticism stirred up opposition and provoked Pestalozzi, who however, later on reconciled himself with Girard, and visited his school at Fribourg. Girard increased the number of pupils, comprising in the beginning forty children from the poorest classes, to more than 300 coming from all ranks of society. The city schools conducted by the Ursulines also adopted Girard's methods and witnessed a like increase in the number of their pupils. The fruits of Girard's educational system showed themselves even more strikingly in the splendid results obtained with the young people who got beyond control during the revolutionary war.

These good results gained admission for Girard's educational methods in the public rural schools and the educational institutions of the neighboring reformed Cantons. Educators, statesmen, writers, etc., flocked from everywhere to visit the famous schools of Girard, and returning home they sought to introduce his methods into the school systems of their own countries.

Impressed by the book, *Nouveau Systeme d'éducation* (Paris, 1815), edited by Ch. Ph. de Lasteyries, Girard was moved to introduce the system of "mutual instruction," and it was this feature that induced the famous educationist Andrew Bell to visit Girard's school.

The year 1818 witnessed the climax of Girard's success. No one surmised that a crash was so near. The bone of contention between Girard's admirers and his opponents was his system of "mutual instruction." In vain did Girard seek to withdraw the question of method from the religious political strifes, which at that time inflamed the minds of the people, and divided them into a Catholic Conservative and a Liberal camp. He supported the Church policy of the Vicar General H. von Wessenberg of Constance, who had befriended him. Girard was inclined towards the prevailing rationalistic German philosophy and opposed the Jesuits, whom his party dubbed fanatics and obscurantists. Enthusiastic for progress, he now sympathized with Pestalozzi. However, he drew upon himself the displeasure of the ecclesiastical authorities by opposing the recall of the Jesuits to the College of St. Michael at Fribourg. In 1818 the Grand Council restored to the Jesuits the College which had been founded by Peter Canisius, and Girard was no longer able to resist his opponents. Bishop P. T. Jenny in two of his official letters denounced Girard's system of "mutual instruction." In his memoirs and public speeches, Girard defended himself against the charges that he supported rationalistic philosophy, that he taught the children religious liberalism, that his method of "mutual instruction" was unpedagogical and non-Catholic, that he destroyed among his pupils regard for authority, and that he incited the monitors to pride.

His System Opposed

On June 4, 1823, the Grand Council brought this strife to an end, in as far as it forbade the method of "mutual instruction." This decision stirred up a violent protest and induced Girard and his staff to resign at once. Thereupon Girard, whilst staying at the Franciscan Friary at Fribourg, took over the direction of the Free School, and was elected to the Educational Council by the local liberal Canton Committee. While a member of the Council he exercised a widespread influence in matters pertaining to school organization and teaching methods. In 1827, he was made professor of philosophy in the Cantonal Lyceum at Lucerne, and being a follower of F. H. Jacobi, he took his philosophy as a basis of his own course. Soon a group of intellectual pupils gathered about him.

In 1834 Girard returned to Fribourg to devote himself to writing. In 1844 his introductory volume, *De l'enseignement régulier de la langue maternelle*, made its appearance and was well received. In the same year the French Academy awarded to him the Montyon Prize. Within the years 1845-48 his work, *Cours éducatif de la langue maternelle*, appeared in seven volumes. Once more Girard, then of very advanced age, was brought before the public because of the Sonderbund conflict. In November, 1847, due to the downfall of the conservative regime and the expulsion of the Jesuits, radicalism gained the upper hand at Fribourg. Girard accepted the offer of the new government to formulate a new code of instruction. However, the anti-religious animus of the party in control soon aroused his opposition. Girard's last public declaration was his protest against the liberal reorganization of the College of St. Michael. He died March 6, 1850. In 1860 the Grand Council erected in his honor a monument on the "Lindenplatz" at Fribourg.

Pioneering in Education

In his methods of teaching, Girard wished to use all subjects for the purpose of mental discipline. He regarded the mother tongue as the core of all school subjects, as being the chief means for a moral and religious education in accordance with his axiom: "Words for the ideas, and ideas for the soul and mind." Consequently he kept in mind the aim of religious education, but was influenced in his methods of teaching and preaching by the rationalistic philosophy of the time and hence employed inductive methods to arrive at supernatural truths. Father M. Rädle, O.M.C., designates Girard's conception of religion as "mystic sentimentalism." Girard's method of "mutual instruction" consisted in that the professors taught the higher classes, and the students of the latter gave instruction in the lower grades. He was forced to introduce this method of teaching through sheer necessity, since he lacked a sufficient number of professors. In 1815 his school numbered three hundred pupils taught by a prefect and four professors. The number of instructors being inadequate, recourse was had to the town Magistrate, who, however, was unable to meet the request because of the lack of teachers. Therefore Girard was obliged either to turn away half of his pupils, or employ as assistants such of the student-body as in his opinion were found to be capable of instructing others. Under his prudent direction his tutorial system brought good results. Whereas formerly the three hundred pupils had been divided into four classes, there existed after 1816 twenty-seven divisions, and hence it was possible to admit one hundred more students because of the method of "mutual instruction."

At present, however, this "mutual instruction" method as well as Girard's language theory have been abandoned. The cause of this failure lies, aside from the inherent weakness of "mutual instruction," in the mistaken efforts to make language instruction the core subject. Religion must be the core subject in Christian schools.

Girard was nevertheless a pioneer in education. He devised new methods for teaching and placed instruction in the French language upon a psychological foundation. His work is original and reflects his personality. Girard wrote German and French with equal ease. Father N. Rädle, O.M.C., in his book, *Le Convent des RR. PP. Cordeliers de Fribourg*, gives a comprehensive sketch of his philosophical, theological and pedagogical writings. The rationalistic trends of the times greatly influenced Girard's philosophical and theological ideas; but his strength of intellect, his nobleness of character, and the spirit of the Franciscan Order preserved him from serious error.

Girard's chief works in pedagogy are the following:

1. *Rapport sur l'institut de M. Pestalozzi à Yverdon, presenté à s. E. M. le*

Landammann et à la haute diète des 19 Cantons de la Suisse, Fribourg, 1810.

2. *Discours prononcés par le prefet de l'école francaise de Fribourg aux distributions des prix de 1817 à 1822.*
3. *Grammaire des Campagnes*, 1821.
4. *Memoires adressés en 1818 et en 1823 au Counseil Municipal de Fribourg.*
5. *Premières notions de Religion a l'usage des jeunes enfants.*
6. *De l'enseignement régulier de la langue maternelle dans les écoles et les familles*, 1844.
7. *Cours éducatif de la langue maternelle* (7 vols., Paris, 1845-48).

FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL IDEALS

DUNSTAN DOBBINS, O.M.Cap., M.A., B.Litt. (Oxon).

The title of the present paper may appear to be a little too presumptuous. For it is certain that the ideals of Franciscan education are as wide as the ideals of the Gospel of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. They are fundamentally contained in that Gospel, and this in an especial sense, since the Franciscan exists to interpret to the multitude, both by word and by deed, the Living Gospel of Christ. He himself must be steeped in that Gospel; the Gospel must mark the beginning and the end of his own career. The Rule of Life by which the Franciscan binds himself is but an ever-present persuasive call to the full observance of the Gospel of Christ.

Commonplace and platitudinous statements to offer for consideration in the present Conference! Yet these are statements expressive of truths which must ever be kept in mind by those who would work for the benefit of education within our Order, and who would safeguard the way to peace within the Order whilst promoting its interests as one of the most powerful evangelical bodies within the Church.

It can never be denied that peace within the Order has been disturbed in the past by reason of misunderstandings and even by reason of false teachings with regard to the necessity of education.

Educational Ideals and Peace within the Order

There has been the truly conscientious conviction that the educational ideals upheld by some of the Friars clashed with the main ideal of the Order itself, or were even entirely destructive of that ideal. We can trace such a conscientious conviction even at a time when we should least expect to find disturbance. Thus, for quite a long period after the middle of the thirteenth century, the Franciscan Order deservedly found place among the great "student orders" within the Church. The Friars were established with honor at most of the great Universities, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna. Many among the brethren were reputed as *Magistri* and the names of

Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Peccham, Roger Bacon and Duns Scotus were on the lips of every student. Yet at this time when the way of science seemed to be so favorable and when the Order seemed to be at the height of success, the way of peace was, to say the least, disturbed. For Fra Jacopone da Todi with his famous "O Paris, Paris, thou hast destroyed the Order of Friars Minor" was but expressing a sentiment which had for some generations found a home in the hearts of many passionately devoted followers of the Poor Man of Assisi. Side by side with the eager cultivation of education on the part of many influential members of the Order, there undoubtedly existed the sad conviction that education was leading to a betrayal of the primitive Franciscan ideals.

Preservation of Franciscan Ideals by Eminent Students

Any expression of the precise ideals that should form the soul of our educational endeavors, must take these past disturbances of peace into account. We find it hard not to sympathize with Jacopone da Todi; he is so truly Franciscan; he is so keenly alive to the mission of the Friars. For him, that mission is resolved to this: Preach the Gospel of Christ; live that Gospel, and compel others to live it by force of example as well as by force of word. His fear is that the desire to be perfect in preaching the Gospel by word—and it must be remembered that the apologists of education based their arguments chiefly upon the necessity of studying the arts in order to understand rightly the Gospel that was to be preached—would militate against what was to him, as well as to St. Francis, the essential duty, the preaching of the Gospel by deed. We may sympathize with such a wholesome fear and with the man who so sadly experienced it, yet we can not be compelled by any known argument to withhold our sympathy from many of the scholars who were so eagerly advocating the promotion of studies. That St. Bonaventure sacrificed nothing of Franciscanism whilst becoming one of the greatest advocates of higher learning within the Order, that nothing of Franciscanism was betrayed by an exact and exacting scientist like Roger Bacon, these are facts which stand out clearly after a coldly critical study of their works. St. Bonaventure's *Reductio artium ad Theologiam* with its compelling arguments in favor of a cultivation of sciences inasmuch as the sciences are but so many aids to a right understanding of Theology

or Scripture,[1] Theology and Scripture being themselves necessary to an effective preaching of the Gospel, remains as true to-day as it was when penned after so much prayer and thought. Roger Bacon's every appeal for a higher culture is empowered by the incontrovertible assertion that the end of the Order is to preach the Gospel and that this end justifies every holy and worthy means.

Education and the Cultivation of Piety

We are frequently puzzled by the attitude adopted by men like Jacopone da Todi, especially when we hear such forceful arguments from men whose personal devotion to St. Francis and his ideal is unquestioned. Yet it must be admitted, that so far, we have not the material at hand to judge to what extent the passion for higher learning had influenced the multitude of the brethren. We may reasonably admit that there might have been few Bonaventures, few who like him, could present so well balanced and sane an example of devotion both to the simplicity of Franciscanism, and to the more pretentious demands of higher learning. There may have been many, and the many might have represented the majority, who could receive with gladness one-half of Bonaventure's exhortation, *Cultivate the sciences*, and who could leave the other and the essential half, *Cultivate piety*, severely alone. And for a Franciscan, then as now, education without piety is ruinous. Indeed, within the Order, so simple is its mission, education without piety can become a positive scandal to many. All our schemes for the promotion of education will result in failure unless we frankly admit that the force behind any fostering of higher learning must be equally strong in favor of a sincere cultivation of spirituality. For this reason I make no apology for the fact that I have given the more important place in this paper on Franciscan Educational Ideals to the necessity of developing our own characteristic spirituality. The way of peace will be disturbed, and rightly disturbed, whilst we fail to remember the simple human fact that some may possibly find it easier and more interesting and absorbing to master difficult sciences, than to master self under that exact fidelity to the Gospel which is demanded first and foremost by the Rule. Franciscan educational ideals must be based upon the spiritual education of the

[1] I am aware that in medieval language, Theology and Scripture are identical, and I do not wish to give the impression here that the two are separate sciences in St. Bonaventure's scheme.

subjects in question; intellectual education must not only appear to be, but it must actually be, the fruit of the primary spiritual education.

In the past, when culture [2] has been the fruit of such spiritual education, the results are such as to compel us to believe with many of our great Franciscan Doctors, that the mission of the Order depends for its success upon the continuous and whole-hearted fostering of the sciences. It is undoubtedly true that the Franciscan Order has been most efficient in its apostolate when it could count by the hundreds its scholars of renown. When it was filling the *Studia Generalia* at Oxford and Paris, it was also filling the pulpits with zealous preachers, and the yet unexplored parts of the earth with laborers in the interests of Christ's Gospel. History convinces us that at times when the ideal of Franciscan Poverty, that very bedrock of Franciscanism, was becoming obscured, it was the men of ripe scholarship who rose to defend its literal meaning. Those who have been most influential in persuading the world that the Franciscan ideal is an ever-living reality have been at once, scholars and saints.

The Order at the Height of Success whilst a Student Order

The fact that education has been fostered by our greatest Franciscan Saints seems to make it unnecessary to deal with that other question: Does education class with the will of the *Poverello?* Other and far more able writers have treated of this interesting subject.[3]

Did St. Francis Desire Education?

To me it has always appeared that the perfect ideal of St. Francis must necessarily embrace within it, as an essential element, an equally sublime educational ideal. I refer of course to the ideal which must inspire the whole body of Friars. There are those whom we reverence as Saints and whom we acknowledge as moulded after the pattern of St. Francis, who certainly possessed in its beautiful entirety the spirit of the *Poverello* without coming into contact in any way with the movements we associate with figures such as St. Bonaventure and Duns Scotus. They are

[2] Here and elsewhere the word "culture" may be used rather loosely, but it must be understood that nowhere is it even suggested that there can be any real culture without piety, or true learning without intense religion.

[3] See pp. 28 ff.

those whom we would call in the generally accepted sense of the word, "uneducated." They have fulfilled the mission of the Order in so far as that mission is to preach the Gospel by deed.

But that mission is also to preach the Gospel by word and to make the Gospel understood and loved by all. As we may say that the whole Church would be lacking if it could not point to its many Doctors and Fathers who have spent their lives in explaining the message of Our Lord to every class of society, so it seems, the Franciscan Order would be failing to live up to the ideal of St. Francis, if it did not count among its members those who are able to give forth the same message in ways suited to the diverse bodies which are to be brought to an understanding of the faith.

The sympathies of St. Francis are as broad as the sympathies of Holy Mother Church. Francis labored and he wished his sons to labor, not for the conversion of the few but for the conversion of all. His was never the ambition merely to bring the Gospel to the poor and the illiterate. With the poor and the illiterate his deeper sympathies lay, it is true; did they not possess as their own his beloved Lady Poverty? But the world of men which he would inspire was wider than the world of the poor and the illiterate. To him, the greatest poverty, and the only poverty that was to be shunned, was poverty in the knowledge of Christ, and this poverty pressed upon the more sophisticated among the children of men. His blessing would extend to every genuine effort to evangelize the more sophisticated. That blessing would surely go forth to every genuine effort to rid culture itself of mere "curiosity after knowledge," and to every effort to elevate culture to a plane on which, far from divorcing man's knowledge from his service of God, it would inspire him to be all the more eager to serve God and his fellow man in the state to which he is called. Any Franciscan educational ideal which is based upon such a genuine intention cannot possibly clash with the will of the Blessed Founder of the Order of Friars Minor.

The Franciscan Gospel is a Gospel of life, and as such, it must needs have a definite educational ideal. As Father Cuthbert has so beautifully expressed it:

> If the life of poverty had no benediction for the activity of mind and the beauty of thought, it were no true gospel of life. Any creed which kills thought, or atrophies the mind, is self-condemned. It may ban existing systems or schools, but only to set the mind free; and in pro-

> portion as it holds the secret of life it will itself become the spring of a new and vigorous intellectual activity. In fact in banning the "curiosities of knowledge" as he so well termed it, St. Francis more or less unconsciously gave the specific principle which later governed the vigorous thinking of the Franciscan School.[4]

When we have more or less definitely discovered this specific principle, we shall have the power to guide in the right direction all our Franciscan educational ideals. We form an Order which can look back to some seven centuries of labor in the Vineyard of the Lord. For us, there can be no problem as to how we may build up an educational system, nor as to how we shall express our educational ideals. We have but to retain what we possess as a corporate body. Not in a self-sufficient, and much less in an arrogant spirit, may the Friars of St. Francis refuse to look to any institution (the guiding hand of Mother Church and the Apostolic Constitutions always being pre-supposed) other than their own Order, to discover the educational ideals which should govern the teaching of the younger brethren.

The Specific Principle of Franciscan Education

The education of the majority of our Friars begins in the schools which have of necessity been set up by the three branches of the Order.[5] Concerning this period the present paper has nothing to offer. We are here concerned with the educational ideals which should be fostered during that period in which the subject is educated precisely as a Friar; that is, during the years passed between the novitiate and the reception of the faculties which send him forth to carry on his precise mission. Most earnestly do we submit that our educational ideals, of their very essence, demand a systematic training in vocation: a broad and sympathetic training in philosophy: a characteristically Franciscan education in theology.

Beginnings of Education of Friars

Of all priests it is said, and the declaration is true: The priest must be a saint, a scholar, and a gentleman. With especial insistence does this apply to the Franciscan priest. Into his keeping is entrusted the glorious tradition, common property now of all nations, that the Franciscan habit forms a link with that wondrous Christ-like sanctity which enabled the *Poverello* to win back a rapidly degenerating Christendom

Characteristics of the Traditional Franciscan

[4] *The Capuchins*, Vol. II, p. 398.
[5] See the *Report of the Franciscan Educational Conference*, 1928.

to a knowledge and love of its Lord and Saviour: a sanctity which, it is claimed, delayed the so-called Reformation for at least three centuries. There is the tradition too, that the Friars were foremost in the schools of learning at a time when culture and sanctity were restored by Christian influence as co-relatives; the tradition that the scholars who wore the habit of St. Francis safeguarded the balance when a false science threatened to outweigh faith. And there is the tradition of Francis' courtesy, broad human sympathies, kindliness and charity, all of which, found as they are in every gentleman, persuade men to look to find the perfect gentleman as well as the scholar in one who wears the habit of St. Francis. Every Franciscan tradition demands that in an especial way the Friar be a saint, a scholar, and a gentleman.

This tradition, as we have said, is the common property of the people. It is known perhaps more definitely by the educated classes. These are unceasing in their interest in Franciscan history. To them, Franciscanism, conjuring up as it does this trinity of sanctity, scholarship, and gentility, answers a human need. This has been the precise reason of the extraordinary affection of all classes for Franciscanism in the past; idealistically, and as seen in its source, St. Francis, as well as in its great saints, Franciscanism forms such a perfect blend of the qualities which the people naturally expect to find in their religious leaders. With the advance of education among the masses there must be an equal advance within the Order in fidelity to essentially Franciscan ideals. If we can chart the rise and fall of our popular appeal in the past and at the present day, we can, side by side with such a chart, show a corresponding rise and fall in fidelity to original Franciscan ideals in education.

The Educated Classes and the Franciscan Tradition

It is a deplorable fact that very often lay folk, with a bent towards history, can speak more coherently and in a more informing fashion of the precise nature of the Franciscan vocation than those who feel called to wear the Franciscan habit: sometimes more convincingly than those who are already clothed in the habit. We understand the widespread knowledge of Franciscan vocation; the Poor Man of Assisi is the world's possession. But he is more intimately the possession of the Order. The vocation of the Franciscan

Education in Vocation

known to history has not changed. It is a vocation to go forth and preach the Gospel to the people; perhaps it may be declared a simpler vocation—to go forth and *take* the Gospel to the people. This very simplicity of the Friar's mission calls for a greater intensity of education in vocation. For it brings us face to face now, as in the thirteenth century, with many perplexing problems.

Human experience may persuade us that the character of a St. Francis or of a St. Bonaventure is of too rare a quality to find more than occasional repetition within any group of men; but the ideal demands that every effort be put forth to make that repetition still more frequent; nay! the ideal demands that the normal Friar be somehow a repetition of these sublime characters. It is for the realizing of the ideals that our systems must be formulated and set into practise.

How can this be done if there be no training, systematic and direct, in Franciscan vocation? It is respectfully submitted that the spiritual training of the novitiate is not sufficient to manifest in all its significance the simplicity of the Friar's vocation. The novitiate is so short that scarce time is given to sow the seed. Besides, with us, as with other Orders, the novitiate is primarily a period of trial. The training in vocation of which we speak here must continue after the period of trial and testing. It must form a gradual unfolding of the mission of the Friar: an unfolding that will proceed together with the acquisition of those sciences reckoned necessary to a Franciscan priest.

What is the Franciscan Vocation?

The Franciscan vocation is a call to the apostolate; it is a call to work under obedience for the salvation of souls. That is why the typically Franciscan mind will ever be in revolt against a purely academic life. He cannot be merely a pursuer of truth; he must pursue truth to bring others to a knowledge of truth. The Franciscan will accept science, and gladly accept it, provided no attempt be made to subordinate the ultimate practical value of science in furthering the Franciscan apostolate, to a purely speculative interest. The Franciscan life must be a practical life; hence must vocational interest in the future apostolate be fostered with care. Liberty to work in such an apostolate is one of the most sacred liberties of the Order; and obligation to work in such an apostolate, in a manner, of course, dictated by obedience, is one of the most pressing obligations of the Friar.

St. Francis and the Work to be Done by His Friars

We are all fully aware that St. Francis abandoned completely the idea he once possessed: the idea of giving himself up to a life of pure contemplation. Had he adopted that idea, his would assuredly have been a contemplative Order. As it was, he decided upon a mixed life and his will in this regard is by no means uncertain. Prayer and contemplation are necessary; work is equally necessary. "I worked with my hands and I still desire to work, and most earnestly do I desire that all my brethren should employ themselves in honest work. Let those who do not know how to work learn, not from anxiety to receive wages, but for good example and to avoid idleness." [6] These familiar words of the *Testament* manifest clearly the wish of our Holy Father.

His chief dread seems to be the dread of laziness. In the specific obligation to work which is given in the fifth chapter of the Rule, as well as in the above exhortation in the *Testament*, that dread is apparent: "Those friars whom the Lord has fitted for work shall work faithfully and devotedly, in such wise that avoiding idleness, the enemy of the soul, they yet do not extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion to which all temporal things ought to be subservient." We can, but there seems to be not the slightest reason for doing so, multiply quotations and offer historic instances to demonstrate both Francis' zeal for positive labor on the part of his Friars and his dread of laziness.[7] We mention this fact here to stress the idea that our educational ideal must put to the foreground a love of work; not indeed, a love of work for its own sake, but of work which has definite relationship to the highly spiritual end of the Order. Work adopted for its own sake can be as much of an evil as the laziness against which St. Francis

[6] *Testament.* See also *Speculum Perfectionis*, c. 75. "Volo omnes fratres meos laborare et exercitari humiliter in operibus bonis . . . qui vero nihil sciunt operari addiscant." And the following from the Rule of 1221 is distinctly pertinent: "Et fratres, qui sciunt laborare, laborent et eandem artem exerceant quam noverint, si non sit contra salutem animae suae, et honeste poterunt operari. . . . Omnes Fratres studeant bonis operibus insudare quia scriptum est: 'Semper facito aliquid boni, ut te diabolus inveniat occupatum.'" C. 7.

[7] "Tepidos nulli se negotio familiariten et humiliter applicantes dicebat evomendos esse cito de ore Domini: nullus coram eo otiosus poterat comparere quin statim ipsum mordaci dente corriperet." *Spec. Perf.*, c. 75. See also, *I Celano, Vita*, c. 15; Bernard de Besse, *De laudibus*, c. 6; *Analecta Franciscana*, t. III, p. 676; St. Bonaventure, *Legenda Sancti Francisi*, c. 5.

preached; but work entered into with the genuine Franciscan practical end has its value transmuted. And this value should be stressed throughout the whole of the student's career.

Modern Candidates for the Order

This stressing of the sacred obligation to work cannot be commenced too soon. The days are gone when men of mature age, already trained in the ways of life, sufficiently ripened, too, by experience to grasp the inner meaning of the Franciscan apostolate, could enter the Order and almost immediately, and without lengthy explanations, throw themselves into typically Franciscan labors. We are aware of what happened in the past: how men advanced in years and often of ripe scholarship flocked to the first friaries seeking the habit. But now the Order depends almost entirely upon those who come to it in younger life. It has to trust its traditional and characteristic work to those whose only real experience in life is that obtained within the friary among the brethren.

What can be done for a man of ripe years in a short time can, normally speaking, only be done for the subject of a tenderer age, by a long and carefully conscientious process. The one, having grasped experimentally the values of life, and especially if he be already educated, can speedily orientate himself towards the Franciscan ideal; the other, with no experimental bases on which to make comparisons, depends absolutely upon the Order, not merely for a knowledge of the ideal which is destined to guide him throughout the rest of his life, but also for an experimental realization of the power, beauty, and value of that ideal. His ambition is to work in the Franciscan apostolate: hence as a man among men. From the very beginning he should be taught the meaning of his future work, and his every experience, as far as is possible, should be so disposed, that it is colored by Franciscanism.

We can never forget that the work of the Friars is a holy work, and being holy, can be judged as to its merits or demerits, not by outward success, but by the inward intention. Theoretically, we might fill the countries of the earth with individuals wearing the Franciscan habit and attaining phenomenal success in pulpit, lecture-hall and mission field, and yet the Franciscan ideal might be as dead as Caesar's ghost. It is not the multiplication of individuals nor yet the multiplication of labors that will ensure the

continuance of the spirit of the *Poverello;* this happy and ever-to-be-desired result can only be attained by the sending forth of individuals who will work in the exact spirit of St. Francis. Our sacred duty of continuing the spirit of St. Francis implies that our educational ideals embrace a system, whatever it may be, whereby we may instil into the minds of new subjects, the meaning of the Franciscan ideal.[8]

Importance of Scientific Study of History of Franciscan Order

This of course has always been done in diverse ways by the authorities in the past. But I venture to think that we are in need of greater intensity in this direction, and as a practical help towards this end, a systematic and scientific study of the history of the Franciscan Order may pardonably be advocated. Such a study should not be taken up in moments of feverish interest or in relation to particular persons or movements, but it should be carried on throughout the whole of the courses of philosophy and theology. If the wise among the nations interested in education consider it a helpful policy to institute chairs of history in foreign universities to produce a better understanding of national needs and a broader sympathy towards international problems, surely the historical study of our own Order, which is older by far than many a present nation, will do much to fire the imagination of our students and to direct their feet along the true Franciscan path.

This study, systematic and thorough, would be more than useful in the promotion of what we have called vocational training. Perhaps it would also be helpful in dispersing once and for all what is one of the most lamentable beliefs expressed in modern literature: the belief that one must look to other than Franciscan writers to gain an expert knowledge of points of Franciscan history. We may not give much value to this belief, but the simple fact remains, that apart from a few outstanding Franciscan Classics edited by members of the Order, and apart from the outstanding works written by that same few, the vast majority of works of a typically Franciscan interest are edited or written

[8] I have not dwelt too long upon the meaning of the Franciscan ideal. That has been discussed so often by our scholars. See P. Ubald d'Alençon, *L'âme franciscaine*, Paris, 1913; Fr. Antoine de Serent, O.F.M., *L'âme franciscaine*, in *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, anno VIII, T. III, pp. 448-466; Fr. Cuthbert, O.M.Cap., *The Romanticism of St. Francis*, etc., etc.

by laymen who, moreover, are frequently non-Catholic. It may be that we have not yet done enough to popularize the results of the competent research work of our own brethren. From many sources come works, edited by Friars, which could serve as the primary material of a study of Franciscan history. Probably one of the most scholarly reviews in the world of letters today is the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, sent forth by the brethren of Quaracchi. This work alone, so often praised for its thoroughness and its scholarship, would do much to awaken a keen enthusiasm in our students, and it would unfold to them, not merely the course of Franciscan history, but also the continuity of the Franciscan vocation with its meaning and its adaptability to modern conditions.

We have said that this study should not be fitful if it is to promote the end for which it is advocated. No apology is needed for the plea that it should be continued throughout the whole of the philosophical and theological courses. There is so much to be done. We are so often unable to offer first-hand information with regard to such interesting topics as these: the rise of the Order; its influence upon contemporary civilization as well as upon contemporary Christianity; its influence upon civil governments and upon the various centers of learning; its geographical diffusion; its work in the foreign mission field. And though some may declare that the following pertain more to literature than to history, nevertheless, such subjects as these might be treated of in their historic setting: the Franciscan Classics; the influence of Franciscanism upon art and literature; the characteristics of our scientists, philosophers and theologians; the development of our schools of thought; the history of the various interpretations of poverty with their frequent cataclysmic results.

Important Phases of Franciscanism

There is another element which, in addition to the study of Franciscan history and of far more importance than such an academic study, may be advocated as an essential element in our Franciscan Educational Ideals. It is the fostering of devotion along essentially Franciscan lines. We shall never dismiss from the tradition of our Order the fact that it is in part contemplative, and that we are by vocation called to the contemplative as well as to the active life: that the striving after contemplation

Cultivation of Franciscan Spirituality

is as much of an obligation as the seeking of work. Indeed, the work of the apostolate, however holy it may be, is subservient to prayer and devotion. To St. Francis, all work divorced from prayer was purposeless.[9] And we are constantly reminded by the Rule that ours is the liberty and the obligation to work, provided we "do not extinguish the spirit of holy prayer and devotion to which all temporal things ought to be subservient."

There is a wealth of wisdom here. One of the chief glories of the Franciscan life is that it does not kill personality but tries to direct the multiplicity of personalities towards the one end which may be attained in many ways. It is refreshingly clear from the annals of the Order that there have been as many personalities as there have been Saints; we might say: as many personalities as there have been individuals. The principle that has always been so sacred to the Order, the principle that study and work of all kinds, even that work of evangelization to which we are called in an especial manner, must be subservient to prayer and devotion, has been largely responsible for the striking conservation of individual personality on the part of the Friars. After all it is prayer that makes a man of God; not work. And it is the development of prayer that effects the characteristics of the individual man of God. What Father Cuthbert has said of knowledge, is equally true of evangelical work: "It is in prayer and devotion that knowledge is transmuted into love—and knowledge whether it be of God or of creatures, apart from love, dries up the soul and makes a man but the shadow of a man: in a word it kills personality."[10]

The Franciscan Spiritual Tradition

It may be out of the sphere of the present paper to mention the fact that spiritual direction should find its honored place in the Franciscan educational scheme. In this connection, however, we should like to insist that we possess a distinctive and a powerful Franciscan spirituality—one which has made Saints of God. The zealous and laudably zealous care which other Orders are taking to conserve their characteristic

[9] "Dolebabt multum beatus Franciscus si virtute neglecta quaereretur scientia inflativa . . . Dicebat enim: Fratres mei qui scientiae curiositate ducuntur in die tribulationis invenient manus suas vacuas." *Spec. Perf.*, c. 69; compare *II Celano*, c. 147.

[10] *St. Francis of Assisi*, art. in *Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. LXXV, No. 5, p. 466.

ideals in spirituality, and the admirable results that are shewn as the fruit of that care, persuade us to plead that the whole Franciscan Order emulate their example.

The Jesuits, Benedictines and Dominicans, to judge from the truly praiseworthy periodicals which they send forth, periodicals dealing exclusively with the respective traditions in spirituality, show clearly that they have realized in this our own day, that the careful preservation of distinctive traditions in matters pertaining to the soul is more or less essential in guiding the work of an Order in its proper channels. The Jesuit is very properly taught that if he would possess a spirituality that would best aid him in his work, he must seek his own guidance and his theories for the guidance of others in the traditional spirituality emanating from that epoch-making classic, the *Spiritual Exercises*. The Benedictines are most enthusiastically defending the thesis that their Order has been the store-house of a spiritual tradition set up by the Fathers of the Church. The Dominicans are gathering together every spiritual tradition set up by those who have been guided by the theological content of the *Summa*.

Slowly but perceptibly, through the influence of this keen interest and conservatism and filial loyalty, these great Orders are manifesting a corporate consciousness of their original purpose and work. To the eye that is keenly alive to movements within the Church, they seem to be riding safely and surely over modern notions and conditions, and to be demonstrating the fact that neither the original purpose of the foundation of their Order nor the means to attain the end of the Order have changed.[11]

We alone seem to lag behind in this great modern movement. Yet we possess one of the richest spiritual traditions known in the history of asceticism and mysticism. We possess a powerful tradition with regard to the direction of souls and especially with regard to the spiritual direction of members of our own Order. That tradition respects the freedom of the individual in his response to grace, and in strict accord with that tradition, it is submitted that less is needed of the reading of books, however holy they may be, coming from other than Franciscan writers: less too is needed of the otherwise laudable insist-

Our Duty of Informing as Well as of Forming

[11] See Pourrat, *La Spiritualité chrétienne*, Paris, 1921.

ence upon exact records of progress and regress in the acquisition of virtues, and more, much more is needed, as is befitting our history, of the personal touch and inspiration of the director. His is the part to exhort and to correct; to form the subject by personal direction indeed, but also to *inform* the subject by the communication of ideas handed down by the spiritual leaders of the Order. The director is after all the chief educator of our subjects. As such, he must himself be steeped in Franciscanism; he must be a lover of things Franciscan; he must be able by word as well as by personal example, to interpret the ideals of St. Francis.

Importance of Personal Interest

The personal element is characteristic of Franciscan spirituality. It is in perfect keeping with the tutorial method in intellectual training which, we are informed, was maintained in the early days of systematic education within the Order. This tutorial method seems to have been revived by the primitive Capuchins, and was probably responsible for the numerous scholars who added luster to the name of the Franciscan Order in the sixteenth century.[12]

The Franciscan Spiritual Classics

Since the ancient Patristic principle holds as good to-day as it has held good from the beginning, *Non est contemplatio sine meditatione et non est meditatio sine lectione,* greater care seems to be demanded in the selection of books handed to our subjects. Pride of place is due to our own literature and especially to our spiritual classics. These abound. But alas! as with so much of our history, so with our spiritual classics, it has occurred to others, very often outside the Order, to translate them, edit them, popularize them and give them their due place in literature. Within the Order we are offered the sound enough spiritual literature of non-Franciscan writers whilst our own spiritual classics remain unknown. Only in typically Franciscan books shall we find the well-springs of spiritual information befitting our vocation. It is not a spirit of mere conservatism that dictates the wider use of our own Franciscan classics; it is not even a spirit of heart-felt loyalty. The reasons may be stript of all that savors of mere sentiment and they are still cogent. The volumes produced by the Friar writers during

[12] Cf. Cuthbert, *The Capuchins,* Vol. II, pp. 401 ff.

long centuries most frequently form the expression of personal experience obtained in an effort to live the pattern of our Holy Father St. Francis, and to adapt particular work to his spirit. They give utterance to principles of spirituality in strict accord with that theology which, in the liberty of thought permitted, the Franciscan Schoolmen have made their own. The vitality that is in them is the vitality we seek to inspire in all who wear the habit. The broad sympathies they manifest are the broad sympathies we shall expect in endeavoring to fulfil our vocation as men of prayer and men of labor in the interests of the Gospel. All this can not be found in exactly the same way elsewhere, and for that reason it would be all to the good if the Franciscan Classics were placed on the same footing in our educational syllabuses as the standard secular works in the various arts are placed in the "lists of required books" of any modern university.

The Principal Element in Franciscan Educational Ideals, the Fostering of Spirituality

We can not assert it too strongly that the principal element in Franciscan educational ideals is the careful fostering of spirituality: the careful training in vocation by methods calculated to inform as well as to form. It is true that formally speaking these methods should be adopted with a purely spiritual end in view. But we can not measure the importance of such endeavors from a cultural standpoint. The student of Franciscan history, the ardent lover of Franciscan classics, one who is spiritually inspired by Franciscan traditions is necessarily cultured in the right sense.

The end of the Order is spiritual; the principal element in an educational scheme to promote that end must likewise be spiritual. This necessity must not be forgotten during those studies of a directly priestly nature which are pursued during the philosophical and theological courses.

Study of Philosophy a Means to the End of the Order

With the secular clergy, as well as with the other religious Orders, we have to face the constitutional courses of philosophy and theology. With us, neither philosophy nor theology can be regarded as being anything but a means to an end. The end for both is the effective preaching of the Gospel. The subordination of both sciences to this practical life is a subordination accepted and even clearly de-

fined by our great Franciscan Schoolmen.[13] With them, the intellectual appeal of all study was subsidiary to the moral appeal. Very concisely, and in the true spirit of St. Francis, has Bonaventure described the consequences of a diversity of outlook upon the end of the sciences. He is of course referring to the study of theology, but his argument holds good in reference to philosophy. The Friars Preachers, he declares, "have regard chiefly to speculation . . . and afterwards to unction; others have regard chiefly to unction and afterwards to speculation."[14] Because St. Bonaventure realises that this primary "regard to unction" is needed to conserve the proper balance between Franciscan vocation and the academic life, he very pertinently adds: "And indeed, this love of unction may never be lost sight of."[15]

Needless to remark, the "unctio" on which St. Bonaventure dwells is no mere sentimentality. It is a word which conjures up a highly intellectual and religious idealism. It points to the duty of the Friar to shun all forms of learning which may be pursued for its own sake: the duty of the Friar to fill his mind and heart with truths known and felt, in order that he may give to others that which he has himself received. Beneath the exhortation of St. Bonaventure there is the Franciscan belief that every act, every service, every object in nature, may be consecrated and turned into the direction of God.

Franciscan Philosophy

The first Franciscan Schoolmen, to promote the end of the Order, speedily turned to the study of philosophy. At first they were naturally attracted to Platonism with its wealth of idealism. But in the same interests, they were speedily ready to turn to the study of Aristotelian Philosophy, and even a mystical soul such as St. Bonaventure comes to the forefront in the new movement usually associated with St. Thomas Aquinas. In our own day we turn for our philosophy to the *Summa* of the Angelic Doctor, that impregnable bulwark of Catholic Philosophical teaching which is itself founded upon Aristotelianism. Quite rightly we have ac-

[13] Cf. Felder, *Histoire des études dans l'Ordre de saint François*, Paris, 1908. Also, Évangeliste de S. Béat, *Sanctus Bonaventura scholae francisçanae magister praecellens*, Tournai, 1888; *idem*, *L'école franciscaine*, art. in *Études Franciscaines*, 1900.

[14] *In Hexaemeron*, Coll. XXII.

[15] *Ibid.*

cepted the informal command of the Church in this. The mission of the Friar is to teach truth and to safeguard Revelation. So far as the truth goes, there must be no question of poetry, empty rhetoric or attractive idealism. No other art or science may detract in the least from the importance of the clear cogent presentation of Catholic Philosophy, for no other art or science can equally prepare the mind for the reading of the "Divine Prose of Revelation." The present method of teaching philosophy is on all hands granted to be the fundamentally necessary preparation for theology.

Dangers of a Purely Speculative Interest in Philosophy

There is a danger, however, which is often experienced. There can be a turning of all the faculties towards strict logic, formal reasoning and speculation, even where matters of faith are concerned, which seems to rob the student of devotional vitality on the one hand, and of an intimate touch with human nature on the other. The Franciscan was never meant to be merely an expositor of revealed dogma; neither was he meant to be a mere thinking machine. The dogma he expounds has to be made part of his very life; his is to be an *experimental* theology: a theology which he has *tasted* in the sphere of devotion and religious practice. For a similar reason his philosophy should never be divorced from an intimate acquaintance with, and a broad sympathy for, the needs of human nature. No means are at hand to effect this acquaintance with human nature and with the world of men other than the close study of the arts and sciences.

The Continuation of Study of Arts during the Course of Philosophy

Already it has been claimed that the history of the Franciscan Order is a powerful agent in manifesting the precise vocation of the sons of the *Poverello*. The history of nations, the cultivation of the various arts and sciences, form an equally powerful agent in making known the needs of the world of men among whom the Friar is to fulfil his characteristic apostolate. It can not be denied that the educated student possesses by reason of his education (if it has been of the right order) a deeper appreciation both of his apostolate and of the various directions in which that apostolate lies.

The Franciscan ideal in education calls for an effort to keep our students in touch with human life at all times: in touch with

realities. Otherwise he approaches his work with purely artificial values and he is immature at the very period where maturity of thought and of action is most necessary. Aristotelian Philosophy will supply the ordered thought and even the maturity of thought, but thought by itself can not supply the Franciscan need. Thought must be built up by experience; it must expand and find expression in action. The study of the arts and sciences will aid such expansion; it certainly will and does afford opportunity of expression. Theoretically, the ideal seems to have been attained in certain provinces of the Order where the philosophical course is made to run side by side with a university education. Where such opportunities occur in reference to Catholic universities of repute, the advantages are apparent. Here the power of Catholic Philosophy is realized experimentally and not merely theoretically. For the problems of men are seen in their correct setting. The arts and the sciences are revealed as forever awaiting the spiritualizing influence of revealed religion, and for the young Friar, this revelation supplies much of that experience which he will need when commencing his work.

Where philosophical studies have been pursued to the entire exclusion of literature, history and science: where students have been plunged solely into the labyrinths of Aristotelian Philosophy, it is a common experience to find them approaching theology with the idea that at last something really useful is to be attempted. This should not be the normal reaction. Philosophy has the time-honored title *ancilla Theologiae*, it is true, but if it is to find its due place in our educational curriculum it should be recognized as an indispensable means to the fulfilment of the Franciscan apostolate. The *reductio artium ad Theologiam* is a Bonaventurian argument which apologizes for the study of all the sciences, philosophy included, on the ground that they practically fit the subject for the preaching of the Gospel of Christ.

The Practical Value of the Theological Course

The practical outlook upon the sciences, both human and divine, has ever been characteristic of our great Schoolmen. St. Bonaventure has voiced the unanimous opinion of the Friars when he makes *Wisdom* and not *Knowledge* the end of the theological training necessary for the Priesthood. To St. Bonaventure, theology can never be a primarily speculative and much less a purely speculative science. Theology is the science which *forms* as much as it *informs* the soul. In other

words, the truths enunciated in theology must all be brought to bear upon the devotional life of the student. In the Franciscan scheme of theological study there can be no such quantities as the "dry bones of theology." The truths digested mentally must be digested devotionally. All this and much more is suggested by the Franciscan insistence that the end of Theology is *Wisdom*. We may allow St. Bonaventure himself to define this for us in his own language: "Sapientia est cognitio causarum altissimarum et primarum, non tantum per modum cognitionis speculativae et intellectualis, verum etiam saporativae et experimentalis."[16] There must, then, be a consistent attempt throughout the study of theology, to enforce the fact that dogma and devotion are inseparable.

But here we enter upon too wide a field for discussion in the present paper. All that is needed for the adoption of the typically Franciscan attitude towards theology is the more intense use of our own Doctors. The Constitutions of the three branches of the Order recommend this most strongly. Bonaventure and Scotus are both mentioned specifically. Yet it seems safe to declare that the cultivation of the Angelic Doctor, whose opinions we must needs value, has led to a greater neglect of the *Doctor Seraphicus* and of the *Doctor Subtilis* than is warranted.

Franciscan Theology

These are but two of our teachers whose works are filled with constant reminders of the practical value of theology. By the very setting they give to the most speculative problems we are recalled to the devotional aspects of all revealed truths. St. Bonaventure's treatment of the tract *De Incarnatione* offers not merely the sublime theological reasoning of St. Thomas, but also the basis of the Franciscan ideal which is found in the *imitatio Christi* following upon the doctrine of Christ as Exemplar of all virtues and of all states within the Church. The same may be said of Scotus. In the works of both these Doctors we find insistence upon the cultivation of the virtues proper to the Franciscan soul: humility, charity, love of poverty, self-abnegation. These are inspired by a theology which possesses Christ as the Center.

When we consider the devotional riches of Fransiscan theology as contained in the works of these two Friars alone, we can easily

[16] *De perfectione evangelica*, q. I. t. V, p. 120. Cf. *III Sent.*, d. 35, q. I; also *In Hexaemeron*, coll. V. t. V, p. 356.

discover the reason why it is claimed, and by no mean authorities, that this same Franciscan theology formed the background of the most inspiring devotional literature as well as of some of the most popular and balanced pious practices in use since the thirteenth century.

In the past, splendid papers read before this Conference, the importance of the study of ascetical and mystical theology has been stressed; so too, the importance of the study of Scripture and of Homiletics. May it be suggested that the direct and intimate use of the works of our Doctors would help to unify these studies? Practically every theory of asceticism and of mysticism finds its place in the Bonaventurian and Scotistic scheme. It may even be claimed that no separate course of asceticism and of mysticism is needed for those who are familiar with the tomes so admirably edited by the Fathers of Quaracchi. Here, too, we find use made of Scripture, and in such a way, that the study of theology becomes necessarily the study of the Sacred Word. Finally, whilst it is no doubt true to declare that the sermons attributed to St. Bonaventure, for example, could not be preached as they stand, nevertheless the material for the only form of preaching that will inspire our modern audiences and lift their souls towards Heaven is clearly to be found therein. May we not therefore appeal for the faithful use of the great Franciscan Doctors? And may we not insist that they find a place, and an eminent place in the Franciscan educational scheme?

At present we are experiencing a re-awakening of the Franciscan consciousness to the importance of a study of every element in our glorious inheritance. We can not tell precisely the extent of the good that has been done during the last few years by the present Educational Conference. That there has been good, and much good, is unquestionable. Slowly but surely the riches of the possessions of the Franciscan Order have been unfolded, so that many of us stand in reverence before that which we are privileged to call our own. For all this the Order as a body owes a debt of gratitude to the united Provinces of the Friars in America.

In this paper the writer feels he has offered but a feeble contribution to a newer understanding of our Franciscan educational ideals. Whatever there may be of truth in his claims springs solely from an understanding, however imperfect it may be, of the mission of the Order, and from a desire, common to us all,

to see the Order enjoying still more powerfully, its glorious reputation as the Mother of Saints and scholars.

Centuries ago, in a special convention, the authorities concerned deliberated carefully as to the methods to be pursued in educating the brethren, and their deliberations were followed by the speedy capturing of leadership in the interests of the Kingdom of God upon earth. Their principles are unchanged and through the influence of the Franciscan Educational Conference we are at last gradually realizing their importance and attempting to give them first place in our educational schemes. . . . *Sit omen!*

DISCUSSION

FELIX M. KIRSCH, O.M.Cap.:—We must turn to our teachers to make effective in our schools and in the lives of our young Friars the Franciscan ideals that Fr. Dunstan has described so well. In our educational system it is the teachers that are, of course, the most important factor. The teacher makes or mars the school. The building is merely the shell. Textbooks are merely tools. Charts and maps and blackboards and other teaching equipment are merely aids. But the prime factor for the success or the failure of the school is the spirit and personality of the teacher. We teachers never had a better friend than the late Archbishop John Lancaster Spalding, and he assures us that *what the teacher is*, not what he inculcates, is the important thing. The life he lives, and above all what in his inmost soul he hopes, believes and loves, have far deeper and more potent influence than mere lessons can ever have. Hamilton Wright Mabie declares: "Personality is the divinest thing in the world, because it is the only creative thing; the only power that can bring to material already existing a new idea of order and form." Goethe may be quoted to the same effect: "Whatever a man accomplishes, he accomplishes because of his personality." And Emerson tells us: "You may say whatever you please, but you thunder what you are. What you are speaks so loudly that at times I cannot hear what you say."

The Teacher's Personality

Hence it is obvious that whatever makes for a finer religious spirit, will make for teaching efficiency. Other things being equal, the best religious will be the best teacher. Consequently the spiritual training begun in the preparatory seminary and continued throughout the novitiate and clericate is the most important factor in the making of our Capuchin teachers. This spiritual training is basic for all other training, and this fact must be kept in mind throughout our present discussion, even if no further mention should be made of the spiritual factor. We need hardly mention the obvious duty of obeying our Constitutions by selecting and retaining for our work of teaching only those Friars who are spiritually in earnest.

I do not know whether you all will agree with me in saying that before we presume to train a Friar for the teaching profession, we should make certain of his possessing the native ability for teaching, that indefinable something which for want of a better term we may describe as the *donum didacticum*. In our Province we have had experience of brilliant and learned men who could not teach. Hence knowledge and intellectual ability are not an infallible proof that the possessor of these gifts can be trained for efficient teaching. It might therefore be well to consider ways

Need of the donum didacticum

and means of ascertaining whether a Friar has the *donum didacticum* before we compel him to spend years in training for work for which he may not be fit. Let the Friar be tried out in the schoolroom as an assistant to an experienced teacher, and he will soon give evidence of his fitness or unfitness for the teaching profession. The Provincial and the Definitory as well as the heads of our educational institutions should be called in for consultation when there is question of selecting a Friar for this specialized training. The matter of religious observance and physical health should be considered along with the other requirements.

But once a Friar has been adjudged fit, our motto must be: Only the best is good enough. Universities at home and abroad should be attended, and academic degrees should be sought after in each case. Our prospective teachers should be given every opportunity possible for specializing in the subject that they are expected to teach. The professional training, i. e., the learning of the technique of teaching must not be neglected. This should be the rule for our preparatory seminary teachers as well as for our lectors of philosophy and theology. The science of education and educational psychology have made remarkable progress in our day, and our prospective and actual teachers should avail themselves of this new opportunity for achieving worth-while results in the schoolroom.

We shall now consider the Friar trained for his work and in active service. To meet his obligations he must continue growing in knowledge and teaching efficiency. Here it is as true as it is in the spiritual life: He who does not progress will be retrograding; there is no possibility of standing still. Hence all our teachers in services should be hard students and wide readers. Their reading should include books and periodicals belonging to their own special field, as well as educational literature. Also none should hold themselves excused from visiting other schools. In the past our educational work has suffered largely from the result of inbreeding: our Franciscan teachers had been trained by Franciscan teachers, and so there was no outlet and no inlet; we suffered intellectually the same evil results that attend in the physical order upon any body of water that is stagnant. We need contacts with teachers outside our own group to remain fully active and growing. We shall never visit any schoolroom without making some gain. We shall either learn new facts or new methods, or at the least we shall acquire self-confidence from observing work that we adjudge inferior to our own.

I am a strong believer in the necessity of teachers' conferences. All education should be an organic thing, and to obtain and retain organic unity in any educational institution there must be vital contacts between the different teachers. Be not too much afraid of academic differences. The value of a teaching institution depends to an important extent upon the number of teachers who are disagreed with each other. The large kind of disagreement which belongs to strong teachers constitutes parallelograms of force which secure important resultants. The point of difference is the germ of progress, and this point of difference will be brought out strongly in the pedagogical conference, not in a disagreeable, personal way, but on purely academic grounds, and the members of the conference should thus acquire the habit of always respecting one another's views. It might therefore be worth considering how we could arrange in each of our educational institutions for these faculty conferences to be held at regular intervals.

Our teachers should also attend more frequently our national and regional educational conventions. It is not so much the formal paper read at the public meetings that benefits us when we attend a convention—though even these formal meetings offer opportunities for learning a great deal—but what is more valuable is the opportunity for rubbing elbows with teachers from the four corners of our great country and from the several religious Orders.

If we never meet other teachers and never look into other schools, there is danger of self-satisfied smugness. We may think our own schools the best because we have never had opportunity for seeing anything else. We may be entrenched behind a Chinese wall and may therefore forget the homely German proverb, *dass hinter dem Berge auch noch Menschen wohnen.*

Similar considerations would seem to urge a more frequent attendance of our teachers at summer schools. The teacher gives of himself probably more than does the member of any other profession—physically, mentally, nervously, and even vocally, and all teachers need an occasional replenishing to be equal to the exacting demands of their sublime calling.

ATHANASIUS KARLIN, O.M.Cap.:—Should the Friars go into education *ex professo?* This is a very interesting subject, but I think we are spending entirely too much time on it, since we are in the educational field.

The Friars as Professional Educators

The main question for us now should be: Are our teachers sufficiently equipped to meet the educational demands of the day? Why complain that so many of our men are spending their lives in the class room? Are they not there in holy obedience and doing splendid work? They were placed there either by ecclesiastical authorities or by their own superiors, and there they will remain as long as God wills it. The present needs demand that the Friars do educational work, and they will cease to do it when there is no more need of Friar teachers. Judging from previous papers and discussions, it seems to me that we are not at all consistent. We boast of the many fields in which the Friars worked and labored in the past and here we question their right to work in the classroom. We Capuchins are proud of the fact that for two hundred years the personnel of the fire department in Paris was made up of Capuchins. This Capuchin fire brigade was supplanted by another, better or worse, I know not which. To me a Friar, Capuchin or other, seems more in place even in a grade school than on a fire-engine, ancient or modern.

Furthermore, have we a right to leave the educational field? During the revival of Catholicism in England Cardinal Manning was clamoring for priests to do parochial and missionary work among his poor and neglected people. He approached a community of religious, but help was refused because such work seemed against the letter or the spirit of the Rule. Who would now justify the action of this community when the needs of the time were so urgent? Conditions now are such that it would be a calamity in many places, if we left the educational field. There are too many calamities both material and moral in this world, and the true Franciscan spirit strives to prevent them.

CANONICAL LEGISLATION CONCERNING STUDIES FOR RELIGIOUS

VALENTINE T. SCHAAF, O.F.M., S.T.B., J.C.D.

The schools which are conducted by the Friars of the several provinces in this country must at the very start be distinguished into two classes. There are those which receive only such young men as intend to advance to the priesthood in our Order. Besides this class the brethren also have other schools of various grades which are open to all Catholic boys and young men who are desirous of profiting by the education which the Friars offer. Since these two kinds of schools have very different purposes, their standards will differ in a like manner, and so also will the regulations for them.

The Code

For the schools which are intended only for members of the Order who are preparing for the priesthood, or for those candidates who are striving after the same goal in our Order the fundamental regulations are found in the Code of Canon Law. The Code summarizes its regulations for studies in clerical institutes in canon 589 § 1.

> **The religious who are properly instructed in the lower branches of study shall diligently devote themselves to the study of philosophy for at least two years and of sacred theology for at least four, adhering to the doctrine of St. Thomas in accordance with the norm of canon 1366 § 2, and according to the instructions of the Apostolic See.**

Not all that is contained in the third book of the Code concerning major and minor seminaries for recruiting the secular clergy obliges in religious institutes. Still some of those canons do bind clerical religious as will be pointed out later.

Since the Code has been promulgated the Holy See issued several documents which have an intimate bearing on these studies. Foremost among them is the Apostolic letter *Unigenitus,* which Pius XI under date of March 19, 1924,[1] addressed to the highest superiors of religious institutes of men, in which, after urging the religious to be faithful to their rule, he gave special instructions regarding the education of the religious.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XVI (1924), 133-148.

An earlier Apostolic letter of the same Pope on seminaries and studies of clerics,[2] while not directly addressed to religious, nevertheless contains much that is useful and applicable to them. Several other papal pronouncements since the Code of a more special nature have a bearing upon the studies in our Order and will be referred to in their proper place.

For our Order all these have been collected and further determined in the *Specimen Statutorum pro Studiis Regendis in Ordine Fratrum Minorum.* Since, however, these latter have beeen adopted experimentally by the general chapter and therefore have not yet received the approval of the Holy See, they have not been formally "published" (though they have been duly promulgated by decree of our Minister General, dated October 20, 1927); they have been printed *pro manuscripto* only.

Statuta Pro Studiis Regendis In Ordine Fratrum Minorum

Those *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* first distinguish the *Studium Generale* and the *Studium Provinciale.* The former is primarily a graduate school for priests of the Order, especially for such as are preparing for teaching in the schools of the Order. This *Collegio di San Antonio* at Rome is under the immediate control of the Minister General and his Definitorium.

Studium Generale

The *Studium Provinciale* embraces three classes of schools, the *Studium gymnasiale, philosophicum ac theologicum,* to which may be added a special school for sacred eloquence (as recommended by our gen. const., n. 257) and one for the provincial Lectorate.[3]

Studium Provinciale

The *Studium Gymnasiale* is more specifically called *Collegium Seraphicum.*[4] But owing to a different use of the word "college" in this country, we sometimes style it our "Preparatory Seminary." It is intended, as Pius XI approves and recommends,[5] exclusively for aspirants to the clerical state in our Order "whose disposition and will afford the hope that they will perpetually serve our

Collegium Seraphicum

[2] Pius XI, ap. letter "*Officiorum omnium,*" August 1, 1922—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XIV (1922), 449-458.

[3] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis,* n. 2, § 1.

[4] *Gen. Const. O.F.M.,* n. 18.

[5] Ap. letter "*Unigenitus,*" March 19, 1924—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XVI (1924), 140.

Seraphic Religion, and they should be so far advanced in the elementary branches that they will be able to take up their classical studies with profit." [6] Although the students of the Seraphic College are not yet members of the Order, the General Chapter of 1927 took the position that, since they are *commensales,* the Seraphic College is exempt from the jurisdiction of the local ordinary, notwithstanding canon 1382.[7] In conformity with canon 1364, n. 1, as applied to schools of this nature by Pius XI,[8] the first place in rank of importance is to be assigned to Christian doctrine; and as a textbook the Pope recommends the Roman Catechism. In the next place comes Latin, which should be studied not so much for its cultural value as especially for its service in the further studies and for its later use in the divine office, in the sacred liturgy and the life of the Church.[9]

If Latin must ever be the special vehicle through which the clerical student must acquire the knowledge necessary for his station, the vernacular must be ranked with almost equal importance beside it; [10] for it is the means of carrying on our ministry for the benefit of the faithful. In this country, therefore, our Seraphic Colleges must develop a thorough mastery and a correct and even beautiful style of English. It is true, several of our provinces were erected for the immediate service of immigrants of one or the other nationality. Still, the fact remains that to a great extent those languages have all but died out as a vernacular in these parts; and just as surely the others are doomed to run the same course. We can not stem the tide.

Nevertheless for some time to come a knowledge of some foreign language or another will be necessary, as a second vernacular language. Moreover, we must deprecate the mono-lingual attitude that all too many of the American Friars take. The heritage of

[6] *Gen. Const. O.F.M.*, n. 19.

[7] *Acta Capituli Generalis Totius O.F.M., . . . 1927,* (Ad Claras Aquas [Quaracchi]: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1928), pp. 24, 27-28.

[8] Ap. letter "*Unigenitus,*" March 19, 1924—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XVI (1924), 140-141.

[9] Canon 1364, n. 2; *Gen. Const. O.F.M.*, n. 20; cf. Pius XI, ap. letter "*Officiorum omnium,*" August 1, 1922—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XIV (1922), 452-453; ap. letter "*Unigenitus*"—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XVI (1924), 141-142. Both of these letters point out the need of a thorough knowledge of Latin for a purpose frequently lost sight of, *viz.*, for the perusal of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church who are all too frequently neglected by priests and clerical students—they being satisfied with a single textbook.

[10] *Gen. Const. O.F.M.*, n. 20.

the Faith is not the exclusive property of one language and literature. And especially in recent times many of the best contributions to the ecclesiastical sciences are made in modern languages. But a great part of those studies will be sealed to us if we do not bestir ourselves to a better understanding of as many modern languages as possible—a task which for at least one or the other modern language must devolve upon our preparatory seminaries.

Besides Christian doctrine, Latin, the vernacular and other modern languages, the curriculum of our Seraphic Colleges should include Greek, profane history, and geography, mathematics, natural history, mineralogy (geology), botany, zoölogy, physics, etc.; in a word it should fit the candidate for the advanced studies of the Order and provide him with a liberal education, as befits the clerical state.[11] Finally, even in the Seraphic College the training in music, especially in the liturgical chant, should be begun. This regulation of the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* anticipates that laid down by Pius XI in his constitution on Gregorian Chant and Sacred Music:

> I. Whoever desire to enter the priesthood, not only in seminaries but also in houses of religious should from childhood be trained in Gregorian Chant and sacred music, because at that age they learn more easily those things which pertain to melody, modulations, and intervals, and they can the more easily eradicate or at least correct faults of voice, if they have them; from which later on, when more advanced in years, they cannot be fully cured. In the lowest classes (elementary grades) instruction in chant and music should be begun, and it should be continued in the higher schools and colleges. Thus, those who are to take Holy Orders, since they will have become gradually trained in chant, will unconsciously, as it were, in their course of theological studies, and truly without effort and difficulty, be prepared for training in that higher discipline which may quite justly be called the "esthetic" of Gregorian melody and of the art of music, of polyphony and organ, and whatever else in music it is proper for the clergy to know.[12]

A council to aid the Rector of the Seraphic College in matters of greater importance is prescribed in the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis,* n. 23. It consists of the prefect of discipline and two

[11] Canon 1364, n. 1, 2, 3; Pius XI, ap. letter "*Unigenitus,*" March 19, 1924—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XVI (1924), 140; ap. letter "*Officorum omnium,*" August 1, 1922—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XIV (1922), 452; *Gen. Const. O.F.M.,* n. 20.

[12] Pius XI, ap. const. "*Divini cultus sanctitatem,*" December 20, 1928, n. I—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XX (1928), 36-37. English translation: *Ecclesiastical Review,* LXXX (1929), 504-505.

priests of the College. But the entire course of studies is under the direction of the Prefect of Studies.

As can be seen from the above, the course of studies prescribed for the Seraphic College corresponds approximately to those of the high school and junior college, with particular attention to be paid to religious instruction in view of its special purpose. These studies must ordinarily be completed before the candidate may be admitted to the novitiate; the Minister Provincial is authorized to make an exception, but he must see to it that the preparatory studies are successfully completed before the candidate begins the higher studies of philosophy and theology.[13]

Philosophy

After the completion of the preparatory studies usually made in the Seraphic College, the Friars aspiring to the priesthood must, according to canon 1365, § 1, devote at least two complete years to the study of philosophy and the related branches. Number 25 of the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* recommends a three-year course for all, but prescribes it in those cases where the not yet completed study of literature, physics, and mathematics must be continued into the philosophical course. The course in the so-called rational philosophy comprises 1) the *partes reales*, i. e., general metaphysics, cosmology, psychology (with the general principles of education, and including experimental psychology), and theodicy; 2) the *partes intentionales*, i. e., logic and criteriology, ethics and the law of nature, including sociology and political economy. The study of philosophy is to be completed with the history of philosophy treated genetically.[14] In the two-year course two lectures daily are to be devoted to the study of philosophy; in the three-year course, at least seven every week.[15]

The study of philosophy is to be rounded out by such a treatment of the cognate branches of the natural sciences (geology, mineralogy, general biology, botany and zoölogy), physics, chemistry, mathematics, and astronomy,[16] that the young Friars aspiring to the priesthood "not only be the better instructed by the investigation of nature, but also be solidly (*apprime*) educated in

[13] *Gen. Const. O.F.M.*, n. 17; *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 15.
[14] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 26 and 29.
[15] *Ibid.*, n. 28.
[16] *Ibid.*, n. 27.

those sciences which bear some relation either to the interpretation or the authority of the Sacred Scriptures." [17]

Finally, in order that the students upon completion of their philosophical studies may be the better prepared to begin the study of Sacred Scripture, it is suggested that they learn the rudiments of Hebrew. Furthermore, they should not neglect the study of other languages.[18]

It is only now upon being thoroughly grounded in scholastic philosophy that the candidate for the priesthood is prepared to take up for a term of at least four years the study of the sacred sciences, which embrace especially dogmatic and moral theology, Sacred Scripture, Church history, canon law, sacred liturgy, and ecclesiastical chant.[19] To these which are more strictly the sacred sciences, must be added those of a more practical nature for the sacred ministry, *viz.*, pastoral theology, with instructions on catechizing children, hearing confessions, visiting the sick, and assisting the dying.[20]

Theology

The theological course in our Order must finally be rounded out by courses in the Biblical languages, especially Greek and Hebrew, in patristics, archaeology, and sacred art.[21]

As is readily seen, the theological course in our Order is very heavy. In order therefore to lighten it somewhat and to make it possible of execution, the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* suggest a combination of certain parts. This is easy and practical. For the sacred sciences are so intimately interrelated that numerous treatises present themselves in several of those sciences. For the purpose of reducing overlapping and repetition, with the consequent loss of lecture-periods, the *Statuta* advise that one lector treat certain treatises under the various aspects of dogmatic and moral theology and canon law. Thus the entire treatise on the Sacraments in general and on Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction might very well be entrusted to the lector of Dogmatic Theology; Matrimony, censures and reservations being treated under the combined aspect of Moral Theology and Canon Law.[22] However, care must be taken lest one aspect be stressed to the neglect of another.

[17] Leo XIII, encycl. letter, "*Etsi Nos*," February 15, 1882, n. 10—*Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, n. 583; *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 27, 29g.
[18] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 27.
[19] Canon 1365, § 2; *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 30.
[20] Canon 1365, § 3; *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 30.
[21] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 30. [22] *Ibid.*, n. 38.

An important rule ordains that the theological studies should be practical in the sense that they be directed to the sacred ministry as exercised by the priests of our Order, and, that they be adapted to the average student of the class; at the same time opportunity and guidance should be offered to the more gifted for deeper investigation.[23] Besides frequent reviews, disputations and similar exercises on philosophical and theological subjects, especially in the scholastic form, are advised—but a warning is issued against conducting the disputations frequently in the presence of the assembled community for the results will scarcely justify the expenditure of energy in the more careful preparation.

After urging the fullest development by every educational means available, one practice is inculcated which can not be urged too strongly, *viz.*, the assignment of written tasks, either summarizing the class work or developing some subject whether in Latin or in the vernacular, "so that, while a scientific and fuller perception of the matter be formed in the mind, the students acquire the practice of a clear and easy manner of writing in pithy and polished diction." [24]

A severe examination both written and oral is prescribed at least at the end of each year.[25] This examination is to be made before the Minister Provincial, if he so chooses, and the prefect or vice-prefect of studies, and all the lectors of the respective school. While each lector conducts the examination in his branch, all present may put special questions. For the written test the matter is to be determined by all the lectors in each class and to be approved by the prefect of studies. This written [26] examination is to be read and appraised by each of the board of examiners; [27] although this onerous duty was objected to, the General Chapter of 1927 voted to retain it in order to guarantee an equitable evaluation.[28] A failure, or, what is called in this country, a condition, which is reckoned at less than five of the possible ten points,[29] may be removed by passing another examination at the end of the summer vacation.[30]

[23] *Ibid.*, n. 39.
[24] *Ibid.*, n. 41.
[25] *Ibid.*, n. 63.
[26] *Ibid.*, n. 65.
[27] *Ibid.*, n. 67.
[28] *Acta Capituli Generalis O.F.M.*, . . . 1927, p. 32.
[29] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 68. [30] *Ibid.*, n. 69.

The entire scholastic work of the province is entrusted to the prefect of studies. He will arrange and supervise the entire course of studies, correct any defects or abuses, provide a substitute for any lector who is prevented from conducting his classes; convoke the lectors for discussion regarding the studies, map out a plan for each class, and, finally, report to the Minister Provincial the progress of each student.[31]

If these regulations of Mother Church as further developed in the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* for our Order are faithfully carried out, that standard will be attained which the Statutes demand, *viz.*, that the studies in every province of our Order "never be inferior to the studies which are made in the seminaries of the same region." [32]

Schools Belonging to the Friars.

Since our Order is not in any special manner devoted to the education of the Catholic youth, neither our general constitutions nor the above mentioned *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* treat of schools open to others than Friars or aspirants to the Order. Nevertheless, several of the American Provinces have entered this field to contribute to the Catholic education of young men.

Regarding the parish schools little need be said. Only the supervision by the pastor rests with the Friars. For the rest they are completely under the jurisdiction of the local ordinary; and the active teaching is entrusted to educators outside the Order, usually to some sisterhood.

It is rather to the secondary schools which the Friars conduct that we must now turn our attention. If the school that the Friars want to open is entirely separated from their monastery, a distinct permission in writing must be obtained from the local ordinary,[33] for in this case there is question of a new ecclesiastical institution to be founded, which can be authorized by the local ordinary. But, since this is not intended as a religious house in the sense of canon 498, n. 5, permission of the Holy See is not required.

High Schools

If the school to be founded is to be connected with the religious house, it might at first sight seem not to be necessary to obtain a special permission of the local ordinary. Yet this is hardly cor-

[31] *Ibid.*, n. 97-105. [32] *Ibid.*, 4. [33] Canon 497, § 3.

rect. For according to canon 497 § 2, permission to perform those works which are proper to the institute is implicitly contained in the permission to erect the religious house. Hence since teaching can scarcely be styled the proper work of our institute, it may be doubted whether we do not need a special permission to establish schools, even if they are connected with our convents. At any rate it will usually be advisable to obtain the local ordinary's consent for opening such schools in order to obtain his support for them and to coöperate with him in his diocesan plans, especially now that almost every diocese is broadening its educational program.

While such schools as are established and conducted by the Friars are in a general way exempt from the jurisdiction of the local ordinary, this exemption is not as complete as that of the schools for the members of the Order. Canon 1382 authorizes the local ordinary to visit such schools as far as the religious and moral instruction is concerned. Beyond that, however, he does not enjoy any authority over schools belonging to our Order.

Because the Church realizes the need of religious instruction which she will not see divorced from secular education, she insists on the establishment of Catholic schools in which instruction in the Catholic faith will go hand in hand with the secular education. Therefore in the schools which the Friars conduct and which will usually be secondary schools, the students must be the more fully instructed in matters of their Catholic faith.[34] And it will be over this in particular that the local ordinary will be not only entitled but also obliged to exercise a complete supervision.

The Code of Canon Law does not lay down any further regulations that will apply to schools such as the Friars are conducting. Being intended for the entire world, the general law of the Church can not descend to details which must of necessity vary, both on account of the varying grades and character of the several schools as well as the great divergence of needs and aims in different localities. It will therefore devolve upon our superiors and the Friars they assign to the various schools to provide that they strive after and maintain a standard second to none.

[34] Canon 1373, § 2.

Special Enactments

It will have been noticed that several points of special interest have been passed over. This was done designedly. For they apply not to only one grade of our schools, but to more if not to all.

Papal Documents

The first question that calls for consideration is that of papal documents bearing on our present subject. Canon 589, § 1 ordains that the candidates for the priesthood devote themselves to the various prescribed studies "according to the instructions of the Apostolic See." Some authors [35] take the position that this phrase refers to the papal instructions that were in force when the Code of Canon Law went into effect as well as those issued since then. Others [36] admit that only in so far as ordinances contained in those documents are at least implicitly renewed in the Code. That this is the only correct view will be seen by comparing several of these regulations with the respective ones of the Code and of the more recent papal pronouncements. However, before proceeding it will be necessary to state that this abrogation does not apply to those earlier pontifical enactments which treat certain studies not so much under a disciplinary aspect as rather from the dogmatic point of view, e. g., the encyclical letter of Leo XIII, *Providentissimus*, of November 18, 1893,[37] and to some extent the apostolic letter of Pius X, *Quoniam in re biblica*, of March 27, 1906,[38] as also the encyclical letter of Pius X, *Pascendi*, of September 8, 1906,[39] and the motu proprio of Pius X, *Sacrorum Antistitum*, of September 1, 1910.[40] In fact the Holy Office on March 22, 1918, declared that the "Vigilance Committee" and the oath against Modernism prescribed by the latter were to remain in force until the Holy See should ordain otherwise.[41]

[35] J. Biederlack-M. Führich, *De Religiosis* (Innsbruck: Felician Rauch, 1919), p. 170; J. Jansen, *Ordensrecht* (2. ed., Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1920), p. 177; I. Pejška, *Ius Canonicum Religiosorum* (3. ed., Freiburg i. B.; B. Herder & Co., 1927), pp. 165-167; L. Fanfani, *De Jure Religiosorum* (Turin-Rome: Peter Marietti, 1920), n. 207 *B*); 2. ed., 1925), n. 277 *C*).

[36] A. Vermeersch-J. Creusen, *Epitome Juris Canonici* (2. ed., Mechlin-Rome: H. Dessain, 1924), I, n. 690; T. Schäfer, *De Religiosis*, (Münster i. W.: Aschendorff, 1927), n. 294. But cf. note 45a.

[37] *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, n. 621.

[38] *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXXIX, 77-80.

[39] *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, n. 680.

[40] *Ibid.*, n. 689.

[41] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, X (1918), 136.

The one document of a disciplinary nature that at this point will attract the attention of the Conference is the *Declarationes circa articulum sextum Decreti "Auctis admodum" editi die IV, Novembris MDCCCXCIII*, issued by the Congregation of Religious, September 7, 1909.[42] It was declared *ad VI* that all the studies for the priesthood, the gymnasial (i. e., high school and junior college), philosophical and theological studies, had to be made entirely in formal classes; if only one or the other accessory branch had been made up privately by the student, a convalidation could be granted by the General Superior, but for convalidating an entire year made up privately the Sacred Congregation of Religious had to be addressed.

Term of Studies

Now regarding the preparatory studies, canon 589, § 1 merely requires that aspirants for the priesthood be *rite instructi*. This phrase is hardly sufficient to inculcate the strict regulation of the above *Declarationes*.[43] Again, Rule V of those *Declarationes* required that at least the fourth year of the preparatory (*gymnasiale*) course be completed before the aspirant's admission into the Novitiate unless a papal dispensation had been obtained. In the Code no such provision is found and our *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 15, empower the Minister Provincial to make exceptions.[44]

Again in 1915 the Sacred Congregation of Religious declared that if a student were even without his fault obliged to interrupt a year's study for more than three months he was obliged to repeat the entire year.[45] This severe regulation likewise can hardly be said to be renewed in the Code.[45a] Therefore, unless the Holy See renews that strict regulation, it is hardly necessary to obtain a papal dispensation in order that such of our clerics as may have missed more than three months of the classes, may continue their studies without repeating the entire year's work. Nevertheless it

[42] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, I (1909), 701-704.

[43] Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, I, n. 690; Schäfer, *De Religiosis*, n. 294.

[44] Cf. Pius XI, ap. letter "*Unigenitus*," March 19, 1924—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XVI (1924), 142; Vermeersch-Creusen, *l. c.*

[45] March 15, 1915, ad I—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, VII (1915), 123-124.

[45a] *Commentarium pro Religiosis*, I (1920), 369; V (1924), 102-104. The authors quoted above in notes 35 and 36 take the stricter view, when they speak of the *formal* classes for philosophy and theology, those quoted in note 36 departing from the earlier declarations only as regards the preparatory studies.

were well that the regulation be employed as a guide to preserve the standard for studies established by the Church and our Order.

There is, however, one regulation contained in the *Declarationes* of 1909 which must be applied to canon 589 § 1. That is the first three replies which determine that the *quadrennium* which the theological studies must last must be fully forty-five months. To apply canons 32-34 instead of that interpretation would be an innovation altogether foreign to the constant practice of the Church.[46]

At this point it will not be out of place to call attention to a recent declaration of the Sacred Congregation of Religious in regard to dispensations to ordain to the priesthood a candidate before he has completed at least three and one-half years of theological course: indults of this nature are only granted with the provision that the one so ordained continue and complete the full term of the four years' course of theology and in the interim he may not be assigned preaching, hearing confessions, or the external works of the Institute. It was furthermore declared that these conditions apply not only to such indults to be obtained in the future but also to all those obtained since the promulgation of the Code, even if these conditions were not mentioned in the rescript unless the rescript should contain a clause eliminating these conditions.[47]

Ordination after Third Year of Theology

As is well known, our Order conducts at the *Collegio di San Antonio* in Rome a graduate school in philosophy and theology with the special purpose of providing advanced studies in preparation for the lectorate. It is desirable that our future lectors make their higher studies there; especially since that College offers a better opportunity for entering into the mind of the Franciscan School of Thought.[48] But certain conditions may require that our Friars attend other universities. For cases where a lay university is to be frequented by Friars the decree on frequenting lay universities by clerics, issued by the Consistorial Congregation under date of April 30, 1918,[49] must be observed.

Attendance at Universities

[46] Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome*, I, n. 690.
[47] S. C. de Rel., October 27, 1923—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XV (1923), 549-550.
[48] *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 54.
[49] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, X (1918), 237-238.

1. No one may be sent to lay faculties of universities unless he is already raised to the priesthood and gives well-founded hope that he will be an honor to the ecclesiastical state by reason of his greater talents and upright life.

2. The only purpose for which Friar priests may be sent to such universities is to provide for the needs or benefits of the Province, i. e., to prepare fit teachers for schools of the Province similar to the public schools.

3. Those sent to such universities are still bound to make the annual examinations according to canon 590 for five years after the completion of their theological course. In fact their examination ought to be the stricter, the more easily their profane studies might draw them away from their ecclesiastical studies.

While the first three sections of this decree mention almost only the secular clergy, number 4 extends it to all religious.

To these general regulations our Order adds special rules. Even to Catholic universities only those may be sent who have completed their theological studies *cum laude* and are recommended by the Discretorium of the convent and the lectors of sacred theology. It is the Provincial Definitorium that grants leave for Friars to attend a University: the consent of the Minister General must be obtained if the university is situated outside the Province.[50]

Use of Latin in Lectures

Occasionaly one hears the complaint that in the philosophical and theological studies Latin is used, whereas, if the lectures were conducted in the vernacular, the students would derive a greater immediate practical benefit for their future work in the sacred ministry. This seems to be the most forceful argument that can be raised against the use of Latin in the philosophical and theological studies. But it is more specious than real. For if these lectures were given in the vernacular they would have to be either as brief and concise and technical as is the Latin lecture today or very simple and popular. The latter would be absolutely impossible; for not to say anything of wearying the students with constant repetitions of rudiments, the already crowded curriculum would not leave sufficient time for such a necessarily lengthy discussion. A brief discussion on the other hand would offend in two directions. The exactness and precision of the Latin lecture can not be obtained in a concise lecture in the vernacular, since the terms of the latter as a living language have a constantly fluctuating

[50] *Gen. Const. O.F.M.*, n. 267; *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis*, n. 55.

signification and therefore lack the technical fixity of Latin, which as the language of the Church is indeed living, but as compared with the modern languages is dead. Neither will the use of the vernacular in the classroom lend any considerable help to the practical ministry and it may moreover become a positive danger. For even if the vernacular is used as the vehicle for imparting instruction in philosophy and theology, all that is learned in the class-room must be digested and recast to adapt it to the capacity of the faithful. Just here lies the danger for the unwary priest who has studied philosophy and theology in the vernacular; he may become so addicted to the technical language as to carry it into the school-room and the pulpit and the confessional and his intercourse with individuals to the utter confusion not only of the less lettered but even of the educated laity.

It is, however, the mind of the Church that the instruction in philosophy and theology be given in the Latin language, as is prescribed also by the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis,* n. 29, 34. This ordinance is based upon the experience of centuries and will produce the more abundant fruit since it will lead the students back to the various sources of ecclesiastical lore instead of leaving them content with one textbook.[51] However, the *Statuta pro Studiis Regendis* prescribe the use of Latin only for the lectures in philosophy and theology, not for the instruction in the accessory branches, and the General Chapter of 1927 refused to go on record for a stricter determination of the limits in this question, but preferred to leave it to the individual provinces to determine which of the theological branches might be taught in the vernacular.[52] Moreover, there is nothing to prevent a lector from amplifying in the vernacular some point of his Latin lecture.

Adhering to St. Thomas

The last point that presents itself here revolves about the obligation of propounding the doctrine of St. Thomas. Canon 589 § 1, prescribes that religious adhere to the doctrine of St. Thomas,[53] and refers to canon 1366 § 2 which ordains that in the teaching of philosophy and theology the method, doctrine, and principles of St. Thomas be followed and kept sacred.[54]

[51] Cf. Pius XI, ap. letter *"Officiorum omnium,"* August 1, 1922—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XIV (1922), 453-454.

[52] *Acta Cap. Gen. O.F.M., . . . 1927,* p. 28.

[53] ". . . doctrinae D. Thomae inhaerentes . . ."

[54] ". . . omnino pertractent ad Angelici Doctoris rationem, doctrinam et principia, eaque sancte teneant."

More particularly this prescription traces its origin to the various decrees issued in the last fifty years since Leo XIII published his first encyclical on St. Thomas.[55] Since that time a lively discussion has continued as to the precise extent of the obligation of following St. Thomas.

The Code (canon 1366 § 2) prescribes that in seminaries and also in the studies of clerical religious the *ratio* of St. Thomas be followed in the teaching of philosophy and theology: Hence our lectors must adopt the scholastic method. In this connection Pope Pius XI condemns the practice of exclusively following the "positive method" of a textbook and demands that the scholastic method be also employed.[56]

The *doctrina* of the Angelic Doctor comprises his opinions or theses; his *principia,* his fundamental propositions.[57] Now the question arises: in how far are Catholic philosophers and theologians, especially in their capacity as professors in ecclesiastical seminaries bound by the teachings and principles of St. Thomas? Even Leo XIII in his first encyclical on the study of scholastic philosophy, in which he urged the teaching of St. Thomas, made express provision for the opinions differing from those of the Angelic Doctor:

> While therefore We hold that every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsover discovered or planned, ought to be received with a willing and grateful mind, We exhort you . . . to restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas. . . .[58]

At the request from various Institutes the Congregation of Studies, July 27, 1914, published the celebrated twenty-four

[55] Encycl. letter, "*Aeterni Patris,*" August 4, 1879—*C. I. C. Fontes,* n. 578.

[56] ". . . consequens est, non bene sacrae iuventuti consulere, qui omnem de Theologia institutionem, scholastica ratione neglecta, ad *positivam methodum,* ut dicitur, exigendam putent; multoque minus eos officio suo satisfacere, qui huius doctrinae magisterium non aliter exerceant, nisi ordinem seriemque dogmatum atque haeresum doctis disquisitionibus exsequendo. Illa enim positiva methodus necessario quidem scholasticae adiungenda est, sed sola non sufficit; cum bene comparari nostros oporteat ad Fidei veritatem non modo convincendam, sed illustrandam etiam ac defendendam; Fidei autem dogmata contrariosque errores ex ordine temporum recensere, ecclesiasticae quidem historiae est, non vero munus Theologiae." Pius XI, ap. letter "*Officiorum omnium,*" August 1, 1922—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XIV (1922), 455-456.

[57] Cf. Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome,* II, n. 700.

[58] Encycl. letter "*Aeterni Patris,*" August 4, 1879—*C. I. C. Fontes,* n. 578. English: *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers), p. 56.

theses which, it declared, "contained the principles and major conclusions of the Holy Doctor." [59]

The designation of these twenty-four theses comprising the main points in the teaching of St. Thomas left open the question as to the obligation of adhering to these specific doctrines. Therefore further questions were proposed to the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities. It is here noteworthy that instead of revising the question to suit the answer it meant to give, the Congregation stated the question as it was proposed and formulated its reply with a by far less obligatory phrase than that of the question. It had been asked "whether all the twenty-four philosophical theses, approved by the Sacred Congregation of Studies really contain the genuine teaching of St. Thomas, and, if so, whether they must be imposed upon Catholic schools as views to be held?" The reply of the Sacred Congregation affirmed that those twenty-four philosophical theses do express the genuine teaching of St. Thomas but added only that "they should be proposed as safe directive standards." [60]

If the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities was loath to impose an obligation of accepting even these twenty-four theses, Pope Pius XI went a step further in guaranteeing the fullest freedom of opinion in all matters still open to discussion when, after inculcating the prescription of canon 1366, § 2, he added:

> But let none exact of others any more than the Church, the teacher and mother of all, exacts of all; for in those matters regarding which it is common in Catholic schools to argue among authors of higher esteem for opposite views, no one is to be forbidden to follow that opinion which appears to him the more probable.[61]

To what extent is this liberty of opinion recognized in relation to the teaching of St. Thomas and in particular to those twenty-

[59] ". . . eas [theses] plane continere sancti Doctoris principia et pronuntiata majora."—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, VI (1914), 383-386.

[60] "II. Utrum omnes vigintiquatuor theses philosophicae, a Sacra Studiorum Congregatione probatae, germanem S. Thomae doctrinam revera contineant, et, in casu affirmativo, utrum imponi debeant Scholis Catholicis tenendae?

"Ad II. Omnes illae vigintiquatuor theses philosophicae germanam S. Thomae doctrinam exprimunt, eaeque proponantur veluti tutae normae directivae."—S. C. de Seminariis et de Studiorum Universitatibus, March 7, 1916, ad II—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, VIII (1916), 156-157.

[61] Encycl. letter "*Studiorum ducem*," June 29, 1923—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XV (1923), 324.

four theses drawn from his writings? The full extent is perhaps best brought home by reflecting on two letters of Pope Benedict XV to the General of the Jesuits. In the one the Pope approved of the principle laid down by a former General which allowed all members freedom of opinion regarding the question of a real distinction between essence and an existence—a point on which one of the oft-quoted twenty-four theses expresses St. Thomas' position.[62]

Again, speaking on the broader questions of accepting or rejecting any of St. Thomas' views—as long as they are in no way contained in the deposit of faith (*aliaque id genus quae in deposito fidei nullo modo continerentur*)—the same Pope in a letter to Fr. Ledochowski said "that the latter was right in thinking that 'those were sufficiently faithful to the Angelic Doctor who believe that all the theses of St. Thomas ought to be proposed as safe standards of direction in the sense that no obligation is imposed to embrace all those theses,' adding that, 'in following this rule the members of the Society can well cast aside the fear of not having due respect for the orders of the Popes, whose constant thought has been that St. Thomas must be chief and master in theological and philosophical studies, whilst each one is free to discuss in one or the other sense those points in which discussion is possible or customary.'" [63]

[62] Fr. Ledochowski, the General of the Jesuits, had addressed the following to the Pope: "Beatissime Pater! Ad pedes Sanctitatis Vestrae provolutus humiliter peto ut Sanctitas Vestra ad dubia omnia tollenda responsum datum a p. m. P. Generali Martin in quaestione de reali inter essentiam et existentiam distinctione approbare benigne dignetur. Responsum vero fuit sequens:

"Sententia realis distinctionis inter essentiam et existentiam, prouti sententia contraria, est in Societate libera et unicuique licet eam sequi et docere sub hac tamen duplici condicione: 1) ne eam fundamentum faciat totius philosophiae christianae atque necessarium asserat ad probandam existentiam Dei eiusque attributa, infinitudinem, etc., et ad dogmata rite explicanda et illustranda; 2) ne ulla nota inuratur probatis et eximiis Societatis Doctoribus, quorum laus est in Ecclesia."

Benedict XV replied:

"Praedictum responsum R. P. Martin novimus exaratum fuisse iuxta mentem Leonis XIII fel. rec. ideoque illud approbamus et nostrum omnino facimus.

"Ex Aedibus Vaticanis, die 9 Martii 1915.

"Benedictus PP. XV."

Cf. Jules Lebreton, "Pour Suivre de plus près Saint Thomas," *Études*, CLIII (1917), 84, footnote 1.

[63] *The Fortnightly Review*, XXVI (1919), 122. To quote more fully from

If all this is duly considered it will be clear what Pius X meant when he declared that masters of philosophy and theology

> . . . should bear loyally in mind that they have not received the power of teaching in order to give the pupils following their courses the opinions which please themselves, but to deliver to them the doctrines held by the Church to be in greatest conformity with her thought.[64]

In other words, the teaching of St. Thomas is the one preferred by the Church. It must be "reverently cherished" (can. 1366, § 2); it must be proposed as a "safe standard of direction."[65] However, this does not forbid the lector to propound other opinions; but he is permitted to discuss them with the greatest freedom as long as they do not trespass on the domain of the deposit of faith.

But just as the Church with all her love and esteem and preference for the doctrine of St. Thomas does not impose an obligation of accepting his teaching; so too has no lector in our Order any

the letter of Benedict XV: ". . . Vous savez combien d'occasions Nous avons cherchées de déclarer publiquement Notre grand désir de voir les écoles catholiques rendre à la doctrine de saint Thomas l'honneur qui lui est dû; aussi Nous ne pouvions que lire avec plaisir les règles que vous avez tracées et qui, en pleine harmonie avec Nos intentions, concourent efficacement à les réaliser.

"Nous avons aussi remarqué avec joie que vous aviez apprécié equitablement les raisons que l'on fait valoir, de part et d'autre, dans les discussions soulevées au sujet de la fidélité due à saint Thomas.

"Nous avons aussi remarqué avec joie que vous aviez apprécié équitablesant que ceux-là sont assez fidèles au docteur Angélique, qui considèrent toutes les thèses de la doctrine de saint Thomas comme des règles sûres de direction, mais sans imposer une adhésion obligatoire à toutes ces thèses.

"En ayant sous les yeux cette règle, les membres de la Compagnie n'ont pas lieu de craindre de manquer à l'obéissance due aux ordres des Pontifes Romains: tout en voulant que saint Thomas fût tenu pour chef et pour maître dans les études de théologie et de philosophie, les papes ont toujours entendu laisser à chacun le droit de discuter en sens contraire dans les questions qui sont des matières habituelles et légitimes de discussion."—Jules Lebreton, "L'Enseignment de Saint Thomas dans les Écoles Théologiques," *Études*, CLV (1918), 498-501.

A recent discussion of this point in the *Ecclesiastical Review* was brought to a close by a quotation from an address given by Cardinal Ehrle, who took a view similar to the one expressed above. Cf. Claude Mindorff, O.F.M., "A Common Sense View of the Twenty-four Theses," *Ecclesiastical Review*, LXX (1924), 531-533.

[64] Motu proprio "*Doctoris Angelici*," June 29, 1914—*C. I. C. Fontes*, n. 701.

[65] For schools empowered by the Holy See to confer academic degrees the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas must be considered as the textbook of the lectures as regards the scholastic part of questions. Cf. S. C. de Seminariis et de Studiorum Universitatibus, March 7, 1916, ad I—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, VIII (1916), 156-157.

right to force his views upon any of his students. He might require that they learn and be able to give account of both sides of a question; but more than that he can not demand.

In view of the preceding it is entirely fitting that our General Constitutions, n. 277, while insisting upon a high regard for St. Thomas,[66] and the other Scholastics, urge all our lectors in philosophy and theology to follow the great Franciscan School. The foremost leaders of this School are St. Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales, and Duns Scotus. During the last six or seven centuries the Popes have frequently taken occasion to lavish such encomiums upon these lights of our Order as must make us proud to bask in their luster and eager to partake of their vast learning. Not to say anything of the praises bestowed upon St. Bonaventure by earlier Popes,[67] Pope Leo XIII, six years after his encyclical on St. Thomas, on the occasion of the publication by St. Bonaventure's College at Quaracchi of a critical edition of the works of St. Bonaventure, seized the opportunity of bestowing his recognition upon St. Bonaventure and his teaching. He recalled that Sixtus V had placed St. Bonaventure beside St. Thomas; and expressed the conviction that from a perusal of our Saint's work the future clerics would derive a great benefit and find the weapons to combat the enemies of the Church.[68]

Alexander IV placed so high a value on the *Summa Theologica* which Alexander of Hales had begun but was not able to complete before death overtook him, that he commanded the Minister Provincial in virtue of obedience to carry the work to completion.[69]

Finally there is John Duns Scotus, under whose leadership the Franciscan School reached the zenith of its glory. His doctrine has been so frequently and so warmly approved by numerous Popes that it will suffice to refer the members of this Conference

[66] Regarding the obligation of expounding St. Thomas in the schools of the Franciscan Order see Leo XIII, letter "*Nostra erga Fratres Minores*," November 25, 1898—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXXI, 264-67.

[67] Cf. Sixtus IV, const. "*Superna caelestis patria*," April 14, 1482—*S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia* (Ad Claras Aquas: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882), vol. I, p. xxxix-xliv; Sixtus V, decretal letter "*Triumphantis Hierusalem*," March 14, 1588—*op. cit.*, pp. xlv-lii.

[68] Letter "*Quod universa Seraphici Doctoris*," December 13, 1885—*S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia*, vol. III, pp. i-ii.

[69] Alexander IV, bull "*De fontibus paradisi*," October 7, 1255—*Alexandri de Hales Summa Theologica* (Ad Claras Aquas: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924), vol. I, p. vii-viii.

to the brief sketch of Scotus' life and teaching by Fernandez,[70] and the more recent and complete life by Bertoni.[71] This question is treated very well by Father Lampen in a recent article in *La France Franciscaine.*[72]

Since the foremost leaders of the Franciscan School have received such generous approval from the Holy See, it is with the greatest security that this Conference can look forward to a fuller realization of the hopes placed in the present revival of the Franciscan School.

DISCUSSION.

ANSCAR ZAWART, O.M.Cap.:—In reference to the high place of honor which St. Bonaventure should hold in the theological seminaries of our Order, permit me to add the following to the learned remarks of Fr.

---

[70] P. Marianus Fernandez Garcia, O.F.M., *De Vita et Doctrina B. Ioannis Duns Scoti Doctoris Subtilis ac Mariani* (7. ed., Ad Claras Aquas: Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1914).

[71] Alexander Bertoni, *Le Bienheureux Jean Duns Scot, Sa Vie, Sa Doctrine, Ses Disciples* (Levanto: Typografia dell' Immacolata, 1917).

[72] Willibrord Lampen, O.F.M., "Le Saint Siège et le Bienheureux Jean Duns Scot," *La France Franciscaine,* VII (1924), 39-52. On pages 47-48 Father Lampen mentions a most extraordinary form of approval given the works of Scotus at the order of Paul V, and relates incidentally an occurrence that throws a strange light upon the attitude taken in certain quarters regarding Scotus. Hurter (*"Nomenclator Litterarius"* [Innsbruck, 1899], IV, 369) reports that: ". . . tantamque adeptus est [Scotus] nominis auctoritatem, ut S. Congregatio [Iniquisitionis?] Pauli V jussu declaraverit, immunem esse a censuris doctrinam Scoti edixeritque, ne quis librorum censor prohibere typis auderet, quod certo constaret ex Scoto depromptum esse." This decree is mentioned for the first time in 1620 (Paul V died in 1621) by H. Cavellus (*Vita Joannis Duns Scoti, Doctoris Subtilis* [Anversae, 1620], cap. V [without pagination]) thus: "His addo decretum sacrae Congregationis Cardinalium quo mandatum est magistro Sacri Palatii, qui ex Ord. Praedicatorum assumitur, quaecumque Scoti esse constiterit, sine ulteriori examine, libere praelo mandari sinat." A search for this decree made by Father Bonaventure Baro, a nephew of Luke Wadding, brought the following to light (Bonav. Baro, *Monumentum posthumae famae Jo. Duns Scoto* etc. [Lugduni, 1668], p. lii sq.): "Accedendum censui Eminentissimum Cardinalem Caponium Bibliothecae Vaticanae Praefectum, qui sane humaniter annuit et auctoritate sua praestitum iri dixit ut biblicum illum thesaurum tam arcte et sarto-tectum tanquam inclusam Danaen, accederem et explorarem. At enim res alio vergebat: Peti enim et quaeri debuit in aula Romanae Inquisitionis trans Tyberim, et secus aulam Vaticanam. Ibi ergo accessi, tum Illustrissim[um], et nunc Eminentissim[um] Albigi tanti tribunalis Assessorem, et ipse non dispari humanitate, habito a me anni scitu (ejus intellige quo immunitas illa Scoti emanavit) volumina ipsa (vasta illa) advehi atque explicari imperavit. Et factum: sed quum ventum esset ad articulum causae et paginam privilegii, duo folia deerant, forficibus clepsa ut videbatur."

St. Bonaventure in Our Schools

Valentine. From the very beginning the lectors and writers of the Capuchin Order drew their most fruitful inspiration from the teaching of St. Bonaventure. The really great teachers in the Order, with very few exceptions, have been disciples of the Seraphic Doctor. Since the year 1638 and up to the latest edition of the Constitutions of the Order (1927), the Superiors have impressed on the minds of the lectors the high esteem in which St. Bonaventure must continue to be held, even though the Angelic Doctor should receive his just meed of attention. In 1758 a *Decretum Generale,* confirmed by Benedict XIV, ruled that the lectors of philosophy return to the teaching of St. Bonaventure, or, if the lack of books made this impossible, to expound the teaching of Scotus (*Bullar. Ord. M. Cap.*, t VIII, p. 272). The late Fr. Venantius Dodo, ex-General of the Capuchins, explains (*Monumenta ad Constitutiones O.M.Cap.*, Roma, 1916, pp. 483 s.) that recent rulings and letters of the Popes do not in any manner intend to curtail the liberty of the Friars Minor to use the approved authors of their own Order in preference to others. Finally, the Capuchin Constitutions, adapted to the Code of Canon Law and approved *in forma specifica* on March 10, 1927, state, while referring to Can. 1366, n. 2, that "the lectors will teach the excellent and safe doctrine of the Seraphic Doctor, St. Bonaventure, and the Angelic Doctor, St. Thomas" (n. 191), and "authors of our own Order, other things being equal, shall get the preference" (n. 187).

EDUCATION AS A SUBJECT IN OUR FRANCISCAN SCHOOLS

Conrad O'Leary, O.F.M.

Education in the Seminary

The purpose of this paper is to introduce for discussion the delicate but important question of placing education in our seminary curriculum. Hence, it is concerned primarily with the needs of our future priests and only incidentally with the curriculum and organization of our course of studies.

If education is necessary for the seminarian to prepare him for his future activities in life then the most delicate, yet the most urgent and most difficult task before the Conference today is: how effect the necessary changes in the material of instruction and in the program of studies without too much harmful disorganization and confusion.

Ultimately, this problem will have to be worked out by seminary leaders together with those who are specialists in education, particularly in curriculum making. I might say at the very outset that it is not the sole task of those who are teaching in the seminaries or of those who are in charge, but coöperative action is demanded with those who know education and who are experts in school organization and curriculum building.

Before considering the necessity of introducing a course in pedagogy into our seminaries it might be advantageous to premise a necessary explanation of a dubious point. In the first place it is well to decide what aim and purpose is urging us to make education a part of our curriculum. Before we can give any serious consideration to the subject we must know what we need and what we want. If we are to be scientific in this matter at all, we must build up our curriculum about our activities and we must first of all know what those activities are. Formerly in secular education, large general aims determined the curriculum, now the curriculum is determined for the most part by many specific aims in the forms of abilities to do certain things. Our seminary curriculum is recommended in general by the Church for the general demands

on the priesthood, but freedom is granted according to the needs of time and places to add particular branches that will serve the priest in becoming efficient in his task of preaching the word of God for the salvation of souls.

It is necessary before tampering with the curriculum to ask whether the recommendations made by so many of our educators in former Conferences regard the priest as priest, that is, the priest as the guardian of souls and the custos of morals, the priest as the watchman of false systems of education, false social theories, any false system of any nature that through education tends to tear down and to destroy the fabric of Christian doctrine and Christian morality. Do these recommendations made, respect the priest, who is intimately connected with the school, who must know modern systems, state requirements, legislation, administration, or anything that is necessary to make our schools as efficient as other schools and to know the rights of Catholics in school matters? Or are we seeking such a course, I speak of ourselves, in order to equip the priest for the class-room? This seems to be the purpose stressed so often by those asking for a course in pedagogy in our curriculum.

The priest is indeed a teacher but a teacher of religion primarily. This paper considers him only in this respect. It does not seem to be the mind of the seminary conferences in dealing with this subject to ask for a course in pedagogy for the priest as a class-room teacher. What seems to be demanded is an essentialized course, a general course, and it is particularly stressed that the seminary is not the place to train specialists. A general course in education would be beneficial even to those who are to be teachers in our schools but the purpose of education in the seminary should not be to train the future teachers of our schools. For this I would recommend that those who intend to teach in our schools take a distinct course, after ordination, dealing with the methods of class-room instruction as distinguished from the more general historical and administrative problems that are to be dealt with in a general course in education. If it takes four years to train one in theology for the priesthood, and this is not deemed sufficient, then surely it is reasonable to demand one year for the art of teaching for those who are called to this particular avocation. Since it is my opinion that the seminary is not the place to train our future schoolmen, I shall speak in this paper only of

the priest as a teacher of the truths of God and as the protector of the spiritual life of the people.

It would be useless to ask the question and to waste time in answering it, "is the priest a teacher?" We know that from the very beginning of the Church, that she exercised a right and accomplished a duty in carrying the bright flame of Christian truth to dispel the dense darkness of paganism. This right that she exercised and the duty that she has faithfully fulfilled down through the centuries, was founded on the words of the Divine Master: "Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii, 19). The Apostle St. Paul admonishes his disciple St. Timothy: "Attend to thyself and to the doctrine; be earnest in them" (I Tim. iv, 16). "And the things which thou hast learned from me, before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also" (II Tim. ii, 2). In the words of Our Lord we have the commission to teach all nations and we also have the command of St. Paul and the tradition of the whole Christian Church to choose and to prepare worthy men for fulfilling this office *par excellence* of the priesthood. First it is necessary to attend to oneself, to a life of virtue, and then to doctrine, the matter that is necessary, the divine truth spoken for the salvation of men. The followers of Christ are to show in their own lives, the life and the truth of Christ. At the same time they are to commend these truths to faithful men who will then be fit to teach others.

The Priest a Teacher

There is doubt in the minds of many whether or not the priest is efficient enough for this great task of teaching the truth of God. It is true, that the Church mindful of the words of Christ and of Saint Paul, has been earnest in promoting sanctity of life and has also been earnest in inculcating the necessary knowledge for the priest to carry on the task. It is doubtful, however, if those who are charged with the office of teaching future Ambassadors of Christ, have been faithful in transmitting this office of teacher to men who are fitted for the task. Many educators aver that due to lack of method, or rather because of the lack of the traditional method in the Church, that the Word of God is not bearing the fruit that it should. Pope

Inefficient Teaching

Benedict XV in his encyclical on preaching says: "If we look around us and count those who are engaged in teaching the Word of God, we shall find them more numerous, perhaps, than they have ever been before. If, on the other hand, we examine the state of public and private morals, the constitutions and laws of nations, we shall find that there is a general disregard and forgetfulness of the supernatural, a gradual falling away from the strict standard of Christian virtue, and that men are slipping back more and more into the shameful practices of paganism. The causes of these evils are varied and manifold. No one, however, will gainsay the deplorable fact that the ministers of the Word of God do not apply thereto an adequate remedy.—If the weapon of the Word of God does not everywhere produce its effect the blame must certainly be placed on those ministers of the Gospel who do not handle it as they should."

We must seriously consider the question and ask whether anything is wrong with our philosophy or just where does the trouble lie. We claim the best philosophy of life, that which the Saviour Himself has given to us through the Church and we in turn must teach it to others. Why is it that other philosophies so easily subvert our own? Are the children of this world wiser in their own generation than the children of light? Catholic countries have become inimical to the Church and atheistic in tendency. We maintain that in this country, the lively faith of the people and their adherence to the moral code taught by the Church is an indication of the success of our preaching. If this is so, why is it that despite the faith and the philosophy that we teach and which we are supposed to practice, false philosophies are undermining the moral life of our people, many actually practicing a moral code and a philosophy of life contrary to the teaching of the Church? Many answers can be given to this objection from a retrospect of history and its philosophy as well as from a study of human nature and of social problems. Are we able to say that the cause of it all is that there is something wrong with the teaching of the truth of religion and of morality? Is it a fact, that the broadening of the scope and the improvement of methods in secular education must be applied to ourselves? We know that Catholic truth never advances in essentials and that we have a perennial stream of truth coming down from Christ to our day. Will education as proposed for the seminary increase our effi-

ciency in teaching the truths of God? If so, we should introduce it immediately; if not, why burden the students with it?

It is a fact that our teaching will never be of a high standard until it become again a profession. The first preachers of the Christian faith, the Apostles, testified of the things which they themselves had witnessed. Their successors for centuries having the same spirit of faith and having learned the same truths in the experience of their souls, could say: "We also believe and therefore speak; we speak that which we know, and testify to that which we have seen." The preaching office is the teaching office, and the priest is primarily a teacher of divine truth.

If education will not efficaciously better us in teaching the word of God then I see no reason why our clerics should be burdened with it. If method alone is necessary, it seems as though our curriculum carried out in the right way could supply this defect. The priest as a teacher should have a method in his teaching and we might consider whether education is necessary or useful in bringing about the proper method to make our teaching more efficacious.

Dr. Shields writes in the *Catholic University Bulletin,* vol. XI, p. 489:

> In a larger way we need men, not alone in the schools where children are taught, but also in the highest of all schools, the Christian pulpit, men who are deeply versed in the science and the art of teaching. To expound the truths of the Gospel is no easy task. It was the task of the greatest of all teachers. It becomes, at ordination, the duty of every priest. And this duty shall be fulfilled just in proportion as the priest has taken into his own mind the doctrine of Christ and with that doctrine an intelligent grasp of the divine method which stands out on every page of the Gospel.

Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical on ecclesiastical studies says:

> And in the first place, it is clear, that the more important, complex, and difficult an office is, the longer and the more careful should be the preparation undergone by those who are called to fill it. But is there on earth a dignity higher than that of the priesthood or a ministry imposing a greater responsibility than that whose object is the sanctification of all the free acts of man? Is it not of the government of souls that the Fathers have rightly said that it is "the art of arts"; that is, the most important and most delicate of all tasks to which a man may be applied for the benefit of his kind?—"Ars artium regimen animarum." Nothing must then be neglected to prepare those whom a divine vocation calls to this mission in order that they may fulfill it worthily and fruitfully.

These are only a few examples showing that the priest is a teacher and since teaching is an art, the natural ability must be scientifically developed and intensely practiced. We must leave nothing undone to prepare our teachers of religion thoroughly for their great work. We might earnestly inquire whether the criticism of our present system is true, namely, that it is too theoretical and speculative and does not give the seminarian a working knowledge of our contemporary civilization. Our philosophy, social sciences and theological studies, we are told, are too speculative, giving the principles but not sufficiently reduced to practice. General pedagogy, it is hoped, will bear a unifying influence and present our students with practical problems that will be met and that must be solved.

Many of the sciences that enter into a course of liberal education have come into our curriculum within a period comparatively recent. Chemistry, biology, geology, physics, and political economy are in our curriculum and no priest passes for a well-informed man who is not acquainted with at least the outlines and fundamental facts of these departments of knowledge. With equal reason, we are told, a place can be demanded for the science of education.

Need of Studying Modern Education

Education is beginning to have its effects in history, shaping legislation, attempting to overthrow prevalent systems of education which it is maintained have been founded on a false psychology and which have been guarded not only by widespread and inveterate prejudices but by the fiercer and the more jealous power of self-interest. The educational problems which are discussed in all quarters as matters of universal concern, are unintelligible without some knowledge of the principles of those who advocate educational reform. It happens not infrequently that men who are otherwise intelligent and well-informed betray a ludicrous ignorance of even the simplest definitions and distinctions and of the most unquestionable principles in education. It is surprising how little those who have charge of our schools and who are supposed to guide the laity in educational matters know of even our own Catholic system of education. Men who are the Watchmen on the towers of Israel pay little attention to the legislation being enacted against the Catholic School System. Have we our school system with all its cost and difficulties merely

to be different from others, or is there a deeper reason, namely, a principle of education that demands our own system?

We consider too lightly the innovations and radical reforms proposed by even obscure educators whether they are leaders or only followers in a movement of reform. We can hardly ridicule the power of any educational movement. The most revolutionary movements in education began with a few individual minds consulting how to resist and to turn back the currents of recognized opinion that stood as a barrier to the practicality of their speculations. This age of radical attempts in education has life in it. Our own system will be dragged along slowly but surely to their way of thinking if our priests have not an intelligent grasp of at least the principles of education and some of its major problems. Our Catholic system of education does not merely differ from other systems by the teaching of religion, but the most fundamental principles in back of it are *toto coelo* different.

It seems as though a general course in education would be very beneficial to our seminarians from at least an informational standpoint. No priest can afford to be ignorant of modern education. Careful attention must be given to what should be included in such a course according to the needs of our provinces and the various activities of their members. We must not lay too much stress on scientific education, for as yet in many respects education is in the formative and experimental state. In most cases it gives us theories and educational problems and can not be regarded as in a state of rest, or of finality. Since educational practice depends mostly on the clearness, loftiness and stability of our ideals we should not sacrifice the time and efforts spent in the seminary in inculcating ephemeral theories of education. If our ideals are clearly defined, our educational practice will be clearly defined and the problems of education can be easily settled by our ideals, our principles of education. What the seminary is supposed to stress is the depth and the solidity of the conception of life of our students. Whether it is said that we turn out theoretical and metaphysical minds or not, every priest must be equipped with our philosophy, our principles, our ideals in order to make any practical working plan worthy of the name. I think that our curriculum should be scientifically organized from the preparatory schools through theology and that we should constantly keep before our mind that our curriculum is ordained for aspirants to the priest-

hood, for teachers of the Word of God and not for teachers in schools. Any branch in education that is necessary for more efficiently carrying on our priestly work should be considered. Too much emphasis should not be placed on equipping our students for the classroom.

Not a New Problem

The question of establishing a course in scientific education in the seminary is by no means new. Its importance has been recognized and attempts have been made to solve the problem here in America for more than twenty-five years. Noted educators and those engaged in seminary work have lent their efforts and support to solve the difficulties which are connected with the problems but until now nothing very definite has been decided and nothing conclusively practical has been evolved. Dr. Shields, in speaking of the qualifications of the professor of such a course, said in 1905 (*Catholic University Bulletin*, V (1905), 442 ff.):

> The question of establishing a course of education in the seminary is at first sight rather simple; but when we examine it more closely we discover a number of factors which demand careful consideration. The course itself, unquestionably, is of prime importance; and if we were called on to say what subjects should be taught, in what order and for what length of time, we should have upon our hands an interesting but also a complex problem.

The general conclusion of all discussions on this matter has been that the course is necessary for the seminarians. All have realized that something must be done about it but when it is a question of the practicality of suggestions made or fixing such a course into our curriculum, all are not of one mind in the matter. Many of our own educators too have seen the necessity of such a course and have seriously pleaded for its introduction but even in our own reports we find but indefinite suggestions and generalizations which have not reduced the complexity of the problem and which have given us no specific conclusions as a working basis. The conclusions generally refer the matter to each seminary faculty and then the difficulty arises how each individual seminary or religious order is to apply practically the suggestions made to particular cases.

One of the resolutions of the Seminary Department of the N. C. E. A. in 1928 reads: "We earnestly recommend that our future teachers in the House of God be given a course in the science of

education either during their philosophical studies or, at least, in theology, for example, by means of a lecture course, and when deemed advisable by practical assignment." In order to understand this resolution, we might refer to the conclusions anent this subject arrived at by the Washington Conference and presented to this meeting in 1928:

1. Since a very important part of the average priest's work in the United States is centered in the parish school, a certain preparation for its proper fulfillment is a function of the seminary.

2. No radical changes or the addition of a special department of education to an already over-crowded curriculum is deemed advisable. Specialists in this or in any other subjects must secure their training not during but after the seminary course.

3. The deacon year is regarded as presenting the most opportune period for inculcating the priestly interest and intelligent zeal which would enable the future schoolman to be a leader in the parish school.

4. The number of hours to be given to this subject, the most profitable type of lectures, the most efficient professor and the availability of some practical training, are matters which each seminary faculty will have to work out according to its own opportunities and the needs of its diocese. The fact is that each seminary should do its best to send forth priests who are well equipped to elevate the standards of Catholic training and education and who are inspired by the principles of the Great Teacher who promises so generous a reward to those who instruct others unto justice.

It might be well to consider here some of the difficulties encountered in introducing this course and also some of the suggestions offered to make such a course practical. In this way we shall have material for discussion and also a means of gauging our own curriculum in order to ascertain whether or not education in the seminary is possible.

1. A special department of education is not sanctioned for the seminary, even a special professor for the branch alongside of the professor of dogma, sacred scripture, moral, and homiletics is frowned upon. In other words, it seems as though the minds of the members of the conference is against a course in pedagogy but

is only in favor of enough to equip the priest to cope with educational difficulties and to know something of the nature, plan and government of the Catholic school system. Although a special professor for the branch is not sanctioned, it is hard to understand how anyone who is not a specialist in education can teach the subject efficiently. Unless we merely acquaint the student with problems in education, a course in education is useless, it seems to me, if it is not taught thoroughly. If any professor can give a systematic treatment of education or any of its divisions, why bother about training specialists. The men who handle the branches in education should be fitted especially for the task.

In some of the provinces of Europe, the curriculum calls for one hour in pedagogy a week in first-year theology. One hour a week for one year would equip the priest with a working knowledge, would acquaint him with the problems confronting the Church, but it can scarcely be called a course in pedagogy, that is, a course which would prove of practical benefit to the priest as a teacher.

2. Lecture courses have been recommended to be given by those who are versed in educational matters and problems. Lecture courses are a source of information, but have doubtful results in a practical matter of this kind. Education is a science and a knowledge of the fundamentals seems more beneficial than the presentation of its problems through a lecture course. How can one solve problems before he knows the principles or the philosophy of education I doubt the practical utility of the lecture courses when the student has no foundation in the subject. There must be systematic study and this demands continuity which is so often lacking in a lecture course. Students are opposed to lecture courses and they must be considered for they are the ones to be interested.

3. The deacon year has been recommended for any special training in this work. The deacon year demands about all the time a student can spare. He is preparing for ordination and although such a course would be helpful, we can not ignore actual circumstances.

4. Another suggestion is to reorganize the seminary curriculum. It is certainly possible to reorganize the curriculum. This is done from time to time and an adequate curriculum revision should include the subjects that should be taught in education.

5. Another proposal is to give to each one as he leaves the seminary, a definite and rather complete outline of the various branches of education together with a full bibliography pertaining to each branch. It seems as though one should have at least a general knowledge of the field of education and that his interest should be aroused before one can be asked to read in a useful and an intelligent manner. It would be very beneficial to build up our libraries along this line for not all monastery libraries offer sufficient reading matter in education.

Since all the suggestions of the various papers on this subject are only directive and general, it is the task of this Conference to offer solutions of the difficult problem. In applying these recommendations to ourselves, I believe that it is possible so to organize the curriculum as to teach a general course in education that will satisfy the fundamental needs of the teacher, preacher, and pastor. Those who are designated for teachers should be given one year after ordination to study methods and classroom procedure. This year could be profitably used for observation and practice teaching. Both are necessary supplements to the theory of teaching because one may know the science of teaching and know nothing of the art of teaching. Many students have little difficulty in mastering the general principles of the science of teaching but experience considerable difficulty in applying these principles to the art of teaching.

To me, it seems as though one solution of the problem for our clericates is the summer course. The summer course has been tried for some years in some seminaries, and with good results.

The Summer School

In some dioceses, in which the seminarians must spend their vacation in summer camps, education forms a part of the horarium. A certain amount of time is demanded of our clerics for study during the summer and it seems as though it could be more profitably used if the clerics were made to attend class rather than left to their own leisure. If a course were given over a period of six years during the summer vacations, it seems as though the aspirant to the priesthood would receive enough knowledge to equip the priest for any field in which he might labor. We could have systematic training in education and the practical work and practical assignments recommended by the seminary department. Teachers in public schools and Sisters teaching in our schools receive much of

their credit in summer schools. If they can do so I think that our clerics should do so. The credits gained during the summer sessions should be recognized by some university because some of the provinces are entering on high school work. If the summer school alone does not suffice for educational credit then the minimum required for extension work should be included in our seminary curriculum.

We might suggest some general points for discussion.

Vital Problems

1. There should be a complete reconstruction of our entire curriculum with the idea of inserting the necessary and essential branches of education.

2. This reconstruction should respect the needs of the prospective teacher since this is becoming an important activity of the Franciscans in this country.

3. There should be a vitalization of the subject-matter in philosophy and theology. There should be more self-activity on the student's part. The pedagogical point of view should be stressed and time spent in dialectics and in metaphysical discussions might be partly used to discuss some vital educational problems, a knowledge of which is so necessary to the future priest. The reading circle or seminar could be more advantageously used if the principles taught were applied to practical questions in debate.

4. If a course in education is decided on then it should in some way be continuous.

5. There should be a larger scope for practice work and education further vitalized through this. The student should be encouraged and not discouraged. If we constantly remind clerics and junior priests that they do not know anything we might lead them to the frame of mind where they will begin to believe it. Some of us are of the opinion that after ordination a priest can not be taught anything. If criticism is given in the spirit of Christ, I think that most of our young priests are glad to receive it and will thank those who proffer it.

6. Our curriculum is ordained for the one end, the priesthood, and hence, we should pay more attention to correlation and coördination of the various branches. Teachers are often too narrow in their own branch and think it is the only one worth while in the curriculum. Coöperation is essential. If the criticism is true that the seminary course is bone-dry and mummified

then the time is not opportune to talk of a course in education for the students, but such a course would be of greater benefit for the faculties of our seminaries. I doubt whether it was ever the intention of the Church that the seminary course lack interest. The seminary course should have life in it, and if this life is gone out of it the lack of educational theory is not the cause of it, but it is due to the false system now in use.

We might briefly sum up the situation with the thought of a noted educator anent this question. The seminary must not hold itself aloof from the culture of the day. It should give a cultural background of modern civilization which will inspire scholarship. Education is an important factor in our days and it is the office of the seminary closely to watch the trend of it. This it can do and must do by following the discussion of problems recorded in the literature on the subject. All the units of the Catholic educational system should coöperate. The priest is called on to-day more than ever to take an active part in education. In order to do so effectively, he must be properly equipped for the seminary and thoroughly trained by the seminary.

Particularly attention should be paid to laws inimical to Catholic education and the seminary is the place to acquaint the priest with these dangers that beset our educational system. The full meaning of this question escapes the casual observer. In every great controversy, especially in one so radical and so ramified as the school controversy where eternal essential and universal fundamentals are involved, it is desirable to know and profitable to ponder the genius and labor of our opponents. It is legislation that we must watch and this constitutes an educational problem for the priest rather than for the formal science of education.

DISCUSSION

HUBERT VECCHIERELLO, O.F.M.:—The first thing I wish to say is that Fr. Conrad deserves praise for his excellent paper on "Education as a Subject in our Franciscan Schools."

In listening to the various papers, so far as I am aware, no one has offered us a good definition of what "Education" really is. In looking for such a definition I found several but selected the following as best suited to our purpose. Dr. Thomas E. Shields in his *Philosophy of Education*, page 171, has this to say:

"The unchanging aim of Christian education is, and always has been, to put the pupil in possession of a body of truths derived from nature and from

Education in Our Course of Study

Divine Revelation, from the concrete work of man's hand, and from the content of human speech, in order to bring his conduct into conformity with Christian standards of the civilization of his day." Dr. G. Johnson in commenting on this tells us that "it implies an education that will answer all the needs of the child, physical, intellectual, social, moral, and religious. It heeds the right claims of society on the one hand, and the claims of the individual on the other. It indicates the proper balance of power between the utilitarian and the cultural." (*Dissert., Curricul. of Cath. Element. School*, p. 92.) Thus we see that the aim of education is first to train the teacher who in turn must produce and prevent changes in human beings; to preserve and increase the desirable qualities of the body, intellect, and character and to get rid of the undesirable. Thus to control human nature, the teacher needs to know it. To change what *is* into what *ought to be*, we need to know the laws by which the changes occur. The task of the teacher is to produce these results in the pupils and these will in time become what we know as "Society." But this society is not a mystic entity but an agglomeration of individuals and for that reason education must produce effects which will work to the good of the individual and society—the commonweal is the integration of what benefits the component members who alone can be dealt with properly during their plastic age by education.

It seems strange, then, that there should be such a question as "the necessity of the subject" (education) listed under the heading of "Discussion," in this day and age when the subject of education is taught, discussed, insisted on, and legislated into numberless governmental educational institutions. To my mind, there is not the least doubt as to the absolute necessity for the inclusion of certain educational subjects into our Franciscan schools or clericates. The day is long since past when our priests could afford to go out from the clericate unable to discuss intelligently or understand sufficiently the many problems which form the burden of most courses in education. Colleges and universities are graduating hundreds of earnest men and women who are thoroughly indoctrinated with the theories, teachings, principles—whether these are good, bad, or indifferent is beside the point—they learned in such courses. These selfsame individuals will become the leaders of the thought which will become the norm of acting in their respective fields of endeavor and they can not but exert a powerful and at times a baneful influence on the educational policies of the future. Do we agree with all these principles, theories, and tenets set forth and imbibed by these students? No. Then, we must counteract this influence and stem the tide of adverse legislation by educating our own clerics and fitting them to lead our people, not only lead them, but be able to give them a comprehensive, correct, workable, and forceful appraisal of the subject-matter embraced by the term "education" at least in its broad and lasting aspects, for much so-called "education" is ephemeral. If we fail to give and equip our clerics properly to face the problems of the future, we are failing in our duty to send forth men who are not only priests of God, but the "friends, philosophers, and guides" of those to be in their charge.

To think that every Franciscan priest should be a teacher in the usual and accepted meaning of the word as referring to one devoting most of his time and energy to the classroom is preposterous to say the least, simply because, to my way of looking at things, teachers like poets are born and not made. On the other hand, each and every Franciscan cleric should receive a minimum amount of instruction in the field of theoretical education in order to make him fully capable of distinguishing between what is good, bad, or indifferent in the welter of matter which passes muster under the name of "education." Somewhere in the Old Testament, God is pictured as asking: "Watchman,

what of the night," and I think that we could well take this question to heart and ask ourselves what we are doing on the walls and in the citadels of Israel. Are we training efficient, wide-awake, Argus-eyed watchmen who will be able to meet and cope with the problems of the times or are we smugly complacent because of our supposedly impregnable position?

We have, in my opinion, the best class of young men in the world, for our students are veritably hand-picked and fully known throughout years of closest contact. We could make of them anything desirable, yet we let many a golden opportunity for obtaining the utmost in education slip through our fingers without an apparent qualm of conscience. The individuals making up our clericates are not all intended by nature or choice or the exigencies of the case to be teachers in the classroom, but they are to be priests and teachers in the broader and more Catholic sense of the word. Hence, we should give them all at least the minimum amount of theoretical education to make them efficient teachers of souls. Education in whatever field is never to be regretted.

As for stressing the pedagogical viewpoint throughout the clerics' course of studies, it seems to me to be ill-advised because not all are called to the teaching profession nor would such a condition be a healthy one, since there are many other tasks to be performed in the Church of God beside teaching, which is a specialized work in itself. It would be better to give our clerics a three years' course in educational subject-matter, and those who are thinking of becoming teachers will naturally take the matter to heart much more than those who are not so minded.

There does not appear to be any definite, well-defined portion of the clericate wherein education *qua* education can be taught specifically. Education is too extensive, too broad and important a subject to be lumped or given in a slipshod, haphazard fashion as would be the case if any given part of the clericate were set aside for this specific and important function. Columbia University has more than 230 distinct and separate courses in education, and this will give us some idea of the immensity and diversity of aspects of education. For that reason, the main points of the subject of education should be so distributed over the three years of the clericate as to permit one to acquire a broad, comprehensive grasp of the salient features of the science. Those who have a special bent for this work could be taken care of after their ordination by giving them a post-graduate course.

Practice teaching and observation teaching seem to be out of the question as far as our monastic clericates are concerned, but if our students were housed in a centrally located house of studies or were affiliated with some university such additional work would not only not be frowned on but would become an integral and recognized part of their course.

An outline for a course in education for our students in the clericate might cause some difficulties if one merely concentrates on the present "horarium," yet if one keeps in mind the fact that any curriculum is a man-made schedule and consequently subject to or capable of change as conditions, times, and new requirements arise, it seems that the task of revising, revitalizing, and reintegrating our class-schedule to make room for three or four hours of educational work per week does not seem fraught with insurmountable obstacles. Where there is a will and a knowledge of the necessity of things, a way will or ought to be found. That there is a crying need for it, no one will or can deny if the history of educational enactments and legislation—both actual and proposed—is studied. The Oregon School Bill and the abortive attempt of a similar nature in Michigan, ought to convince us all that legislation of this kind will, in the future, be resorted to more and more to rob us of our parochial schools. It is foolish to say that the Constitution guarantees such rights irrevocably because where the majority rules, the laws made and enacted into the Constitution as amendments by the majority will bind the

minority—and we are in the minority on the school question. Further, the Masons of the Southern Jurisdiction have openly avowed their intention of leaving no stone unturned until they accomplish their end to legislate our Catholic schools out of existence. Hence, we must prepare our future priests to meet this menace with the best possible equipment—and that is education and a thorough-going understanding of its theories, trends, and implications.

After giving the curriculum in vogue in our clericates a careful study, it appears that the best possible course in education would be one which would include the following subjects in education arranged in the following order:

For the first year: History of Education.

For the second year: Principles of Education (Philosophy of Education).

For the third year: Educational Psychology.

To make this course worth the candle or effort, the classes in education should be given at least three times a week for the entire year. The "*Simplex*" year—where this holds—is no time for teaching education and, in my opinion, no lasting good would come of any attempt to cram an educational course into that year which is one of the most important preparatory years of a priest's life.

Summer school as the cure-all does not strike me as offering any real solution simply because summer school at best labors under several serious drawbacks, namely, the five or six weeks are all too short to accomplish anything more than to acquire a bowing acquaintance with the subject in hand, it is too cursory and this of necessity due to lack of sufficient time, and finally, it lacks the prime prerequisite of all worth-while study: *continuity*.

THE TRAINING OF OUR FRANCISCAN TEACHERS

VINCENT FOCHTMAN, O.F.M., Ph.D.

In his *Education and a Good Life* Bertrand Russell deplores the waste of talent in the present manner of higher studies. Owing to the high cost of such a training, economic conditions not talent largely decide who are to be our doctors, our lawyers, and our professors:

> The consequence (of the expense entailed in a university education) is that the principle of selection is social and hereditary not fitness for the work. Take medicine as illustrative. A community which wished to have its doctoring done efficiently would select for medical training those young people who showed most keenness and aptitude for the work. At present this principle is applied partially to select among those who can afford the training; but it is quite probable that many of those who would make the best doctors are too poor to take the course. This involves a deplorable waste of talent.[1]

In this regard religious orders are peculiarly fortunate. The Seraphic College has narrowed down the number of applicants for religious life to those that are morally and intellectually capable. A further sifting in the philosophical and theological courses reveals the fitness or the unfitness of the members for higher, more specialized studies. Thus the various orders are able to select and further the university training of the best student, of many a youth who else had been "to fortune and to fame unknown."

Selecting Our Teachers

To determine who are to enjoy the advantages of a higher education, to select worthy and able candidates for the teaching profession is of paramount importance. How is this selection to be made? How may we fix the qualifications of our future teachers? To do this we must first make clear to ourselves the aims of Catholic education. These aims, I take it, may be reduced to three: to impart pertinent knowledge, to call into play latent powers, and

[1] *Education and a Good Life* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1926), 395 ff.

to foster healthy interests, or, as Monsignor Pace puts it, "to develop the intelligence, to increase the knowledge and to form the character of the student." [2]

These aims will be attained only by a teacher who possesses virtue and personality, knowledge, and teaching ability. Therefore in selecting a candidate for the teaching profession, three questions should be put: Is he a man of personality, one to whom his students will look up with respect, a man of virtue, whose example will prove an inspiration? Does he possess or is he capable of acquiring the knowledge of the subject he is to teach? Does he give evidence of ability to impart his knowledge?

It is hardly necessary to show the importance of the first requisite. What Quintilian demands of the teacher of rhetoric applies in greater measure to the religious teacher, "Sit ergo tam eloquentia quam moribus praestantissimus, qui ad Phoenicis Homerici exemplum dicere ac facere doceat." [3]

In regard to knowledge I would emphasize the desirability of broad general culture. Few things are more depressing than the sight of a teacher who has knowledge, perhaps a deep and exhaustive knowledge of his subject, and nothing besides, who lacks the broad foundation of general culture. I fully subscribe to the words of Hugo Muensterberg:

> The teacher must be primarily a person of broad general education. No teacher can have that wholesome influence on the youth of the country . . . unless she is in intimate contact with the history of mankind, with the greatest works of literature and art, with the fundamental laws of nature and society. In this way her information may include everything which is essential for equipping a broad and educated personality.[4]

Interest in one's field is perhaps the most important of all factors contributing to success in teaching. F. B. Knight, in his *Qualities Related to Success in Teaching*, has this to say:

> These data, as a whole, may be interpreted to mean that the general factor of interest in one's work becomes the dominant factor in determining one's success in teaching. . . . Other measurable traits, either alone or in combinations, are not adequate explanations of teaching success.[5]

---

[2] Education, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, V, 295.
[3] *Institutio Oratoria* (New York: G. P. Putnams Sons, 1921), 222.
[4] *Vocation and Learning* (St. Louis: People's University, 1912).
[5] *Qualities Related to Success in Teaching*, Teachers' College Contributions to Education, No. 120, 1922, IX.

Teaching ability therefore depends largely on interest in one's subject. One possessed of genuine interest in any field makes light of time and labor in the acquirement of knowledge. He is not satisfied with the bare essentials of the subject. He has a thirst for all knowledge pertaining to his chosen field.

However, interest is not enough. Liking for the teaching profession is not to be undervalued as a contributory factor. It is only this liking that will make the teacher proof against the drudgery, monotony and lack of appreciation connected with his work. Allow me once again to quote Muensterberg:

> It is not his knowledge, not his energy and his industry nor his skill nor his practice; it is essentially an educational enthusiasm which makes the teacher's personality. A teacher who does not feel the beauty and the sacredness of his mission and who has entered school, not because his heart was full of the desire to teach the youth, but just to have a job and to earn a living, is doing harm to the pupils and greater harm to himself.[6]

Having determined what we must expect of our teachers, we should not find it very hard to select candidates for our teaching staffs. We can be guided in our choice by answering the question: Who has the character, the intellectual equipment, and the teaching ability befitting a Franciscan teacher?

The years spent in college and seminary should give the authorities an opportunity to form a good estimate of the candidate's character and moral make-up. Colegrove says:

> If as students they have been accurate, industrious, systematic, and zealous for truth, they will take these qualities with them into the schoolroom as teachers. . . . If they have acquired habits of keen observation, order, firmness, dependability, tact, cheerfulness, and dignity, these same habits will be a part of their equipment for their work. The process of becoming a real teacher is the acquirement of these qualities and habits.[7]

It should not be more difficult to determine the intellectual equipment. The marks given for class work and seminar papers will generally point out those among the student body who have a bent towards scholarship and talent for higher studies. But how are we to decide the interest for any particular field? We live in an age of questionnaires. Might we not make use of them for this purpose, to determine the qualifications of candidates for

[6] *Psychology and the Teacher* (New York: D. Appleton, 1910), 316.
[7] Chauncey B. Colegrove, *The Teacher and the School* (New York: Scribners, 1910), 5.

teaching? I would suggest three questionnaires: one for students graduating from college, another for those completing the philosophical course, and a third for such as have finished their theological training. By means of such questionnaires it ought to be easy to determine just where a student's interests lie. At the end of college, such questionnaires would show in some perhaps a liking for mathematics and the exact sciences. A questionnaire at the end of the philosophical course might reveal in these same students a deepening of this interest. In others they might discover a decided preference for languages, in others again for literature. Still others might display an inclination towards history. The answers to such questionnaires taken together with a record of their class work would possess a twofold advantage. They would give a good indication of interests and also show whether the necessary cultural background for a special subject is present. The importance of this cultural background has already been touched upon. Akin to this is a solid grounding in the different branches of knowledge that form an indispensable prerequisite and foundation for specialized study. The student of history, for instance, must have a liking for and a knowledge of languages. Otherwise, how will he be able to get at his sources? The scientist should have a solid grounding in mathematics. The teacher of languages should have a taste for good literature. *Mutatis mutandis* the same holds for all other special studies.

Teaching ability is the least tangible of all the qualities that go to make up a teacher worthy of the name, but is for that reason not one whit less necessary than the other two. Sailer justly observes:

> Es kann Tugend ohne Wissenschaft, Wissenschaft ohne Lehrgabe sein; aber nur in Vereinigung bilden sie den Charakter des wuerdigen Universitaetslehrers. Ohne Wissenschaft kann er nicht lehren; ohne Lehrgabe wird er sein Wissen nicht zum Wissen anderer machen koennen; ohne Tugend wird er seine Kollegen druecken und seinen Hoerern zum Unsinne vorleuchten. Die Tugend macht ihn zum Menschen, d. i. zum Muster der Jugend und zum ertraeglichen, geniessbaren Kollegen; die Wissenschaft zum Gelehrten: Wissenschaft und Lehrgabe zum Lehrer; Tugend, Wissenschaft, Lehrgabe zum wuerdigen Universitaetslehrer.[8]

While difficult, it is not impossible to determine who has teaching ability. In fact, our Seraphic Colleges and other institutions

[8] Johann Michael Sailer, *Erziehung fuer Erzieher* (neu herausgegeben von Dr. theol. Johannes Baier, Freiburg i./B.: Herder, 1899), 207.

provide us with an excellent means of decision. A year spent as instructor in one of these institutions should give a fair estimate of the teaching ability of the candidate. It should show whether he has skill in governing classes, in organizing the material for study, in arousing interest, in putting questions. Incidentally, such a year spent as instructor need not be regarded as a waste, for the subjects assigned could be such as might form a foundation for future work.

The definite selection of the candidate for the teaching profession should, it seems to me, be made only after the full seminary course has been finished. There is much to recommend the completion of academical training before professional training is entered upon. Only one who has mastered the essentials will fully benefit by the thoroughness and variety of the courses offered by a university. Or, as Hinsdale puts it, "Academical preparation must precede professional. . . . The rationale of no subject can be taught before the subject is measurably understood."[9] The teacher who has gone through the *cursus passivus* will be less apt to burden his pupils with an all too specialized and detailed treatment of the subject in hand—an error only too common with those who have not had the benefit of the full *cursus passivus*. He will also be in a position to profit by the method and the example of the academical and professional teachers. Nor should we overlook the fact that the selection of the teacher will thereby be rendered more accurate.

From what has been said, it is evident that the teacher is best qualified to pass on the fitness of the student to take up higher studies. If I am not mistaken, the custom has become quite general for the teacher who notices a special aptitude in any student not only to encourage him but to recommend him to the Minister Provincial. Would it not be advisable for the teachers of the different educational institutions, of the colleges, of the houses of philosophy and theology to form an academic senate to pass on the qualifications of the candidate for admission to their ranks?

Intimately connected with the problem of selection is the determination of the number of trained teachers each province should have. The minimum, it seems to me, is one for each of the main branches taught. I should put down as main branches English literature, modern languages, classic languages, mathe-

[9] B. A. Hinsdale, *Studies in Education* (Werner School Book Co., 1896), 203.

matics, exact sciences, religion, psychology, sociology, epistemology and ontology, history of philosophy, moral theology, canon law, Scripture of the Old, Scripture of the New Testament, dogmatic theology, fundamental theology together with the history of dogmas, church history. Naturally in provinces that conduct several educational institutions the number would have to be proportionately increased. A greater number of trained teachers would be to the advantage of every province. The constitutions of our Order recommend that after the ordinary theological course has been completed an extra year be added for the study of sacred eloquence. Why not offer those who feel an inclination to teach and study rather than to preach at least one extra year for specialization? Those that manifest special talent could be allowed to complete their post-graduate work. This would help to put an end to the stop-gap method, which is unfortunately so prevalent at the present time. It would also tend to foster a spirit of scholarship and emulation. If those destined for pastoral work require an extra year of preparation, how much more those who are entering upon the arduous profession of teaching.

Which University?

Hardly less important than the selection of the candidate, is the choice of the University. In his essay on Normal Schools the learned Bishop Spalding remarks:

> There are men to be brought into intimate contact with whom is to receive a liberal education; and there are universities where one may spend years and bring away only an acquired stupidity which is worse and more irremediable than the natural kind.[10]

To secure the best results, then, it should be our endeavor to choose the best university either here or abroad. Neither distance nor the fact that a peculiarly efficient university is situated in a foreign country should influence our choice. In the days when a journey to the universities of Paris, Oxford, or Cambridge meant months, these universities were thronged with student Friars from all the countries of Europe. Today a trip to any of the great university centers never involves more than three weeks. Besides we Franciscans are in the fortunate position of having establishments in most of the university cities of the world. Not to speak of the United States, there are Franciscan Friaries in Rome, Milan, Paris, Louvain, Oxford, Dublin, Cork, Berlin,

[10] "Normal Schools for Catholics," *Catholic World*, LI (1890), 91.

Bonn, Munich, Breslau, Halle, Cologne, Freiburg in Germany, Freiburg in Switzerland, Vienna, Innsbruck, Prague, Warsaw, and Budapest.

A post-graduate course in an American university naturally has decided advantages. There is first of all the advantage of studying in one's mother tongue. Then again the different branches will be treated from the American point of view. Thus in moral theology and sociology problems bearing on American conditions a more detailed treatment. In fundamental theology I might instance the better acquaintance with the non-Catholic religious organizations of America; in philosophy, the special attention given to the origin and development of American schools of thought, in history, the emphasis laid on all that pertains to the history of our country.

On the other hand a foreign university offers advantages peculiarly its own: a perspective as it were of our problem and schools of thought, a more impersonal treatment made possible by detachment from the scene, a broadening of one's mental horizon, finally the inestimable advantage of "seeing ourselves as others see us."

Universities, like all other institutions of learning, are as good as their teaching staff. Most universities are especially good in one or the other department. It must be borne in mind, however, that many a valuable department may not be able to keep up its high standard, because its best professors have been called to other universities.

What universities then offer special inducements in the branches our men may be called upon to pursue? In view of your acquaintance with the excellence of many of our American state and other secular universities in several of the above mentioned branches it does not seem necessary to call especial attention to them.

To the student of Sacred Scripture, Rome offers exceptional advantages. There we have the Biblical Institute, many of whose professors are members of the Biblical Commission. There also is the well-staffed scripture department of the Collegio di S. Antonio. In Jerusalem rare opportunities are offered by the Franciscan School of Sacred Scripture under the direction of Dr. Maurus Witzel, O.F.M., internationally known as an authority on scriptural languages. American interest in biblical study has supplied

that indispensable requisite for the serious student, a well-stocked library. The University of Louvain ranks high in the department of Sacred Scripture, emphasing the oriental languages. The University of Breslau also deserves a place of honor. I do not think it necessary to call special attention to the school of Scripture in the Catholic University of America under the able direction of Dr. H. Schumacher and Dr. F. J. Cöln.

Innsbruck is recommended for its course in moral theology. Canon law, of course, is best studied in the Eternal City. There one has the advantage of studying under professors who are connected with the Roman congregations and are thereby best equipped to expound the Code of Canon Law.

The merits of the course in church history at the Catholic University are known to you all. This branch also receives an excellent exposition at the hands of Professor Dr. Pfeilschifter and other professors at the University of Munich. The internationally known Fr. Livarius Oliger, O.F.M., heads the department of history at the Collegio di S. Antonio in Rome. This last named course is of especial interest by reason of the opportunities given for studying the monuments of the early Christian Church.

The University of Muenster in Westphalia is known throughout Germany for its course in pastoral theology.

In philosophy, the University of Munich offers courses by Professor Dr. J. Geyser, who has justly been called the greatest Catholic thinker in Germany. There also is Professor Dr. Martin Grabmann, the renowned historian of medieval philosophy. While not connected with the department of philosophy, Dr. Grabmann is ever ready to be of assistance to any student of that subject. In this connection allow me to mention the exceptional opportunities for research work in medieval philosophy offered by the splendid National Library of Munich. The psychological department until recently under the able direction of that cultured scholar and gentleman, Professor Dr. Erich Becher, now deceased, has always maintained the high standard set for it by Professor Kuelpe. Other important centers are Bonn under Professor Dyroff, Freiburg, Wuerzburg, Louvain with its splendidly staffed Institute of St. Thomas, where the names of Professors De Wulf, Noel and Michotte are a sufficient indication of its high standards. Milan under the able guidance of Dr. Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M., and finally closer to us the department of psychology in the Catho-

lic University in Washington under those worthy disciples of Wundt and Kuelpe, Doctors Pace and Moore—all offer exceptional opportunities to the student of philosophy and psychology.

The department of classic languages in the Catholic University is deservedly famous. In Germany, excellent courses in Latin and Greek are given in Munich and Berlin.

With regard to the teachers of modern languages, would it not be advisable for them to do their post-graduate work in the respective countries? They could study Italian in Rome or Milan, French in Paris, German in one of the German universities, Munich, Bonn, Freiburg, or Wuerzburg, and Spanish in Madrid.

No university, I am sure, will be hardy enough to claim that the student who has passed through its halls is a finished teacher and a thorough scholar. The university can at most increase his stock of knowledge, give the impulse towards scholarship and instruct the student in the use of the instruments and methods of learning and teaching. Only the school of life, the classroom and the study will finish that process and produce the cultured scholar and teacher.

What should be done to help this process, to assist the graduate of the university to become a truly eminent teacher? Of prime importance is the opportunity to specialize. Austin O'Malley approves of the saying, "*Timeo hominem unius libri,*" because as he humorously puts it, the man of one book is generally a deadly bore. The man who concentrates on one field of learning runs this same risk; yet he is likely to become distinguished as a scholar and teacher. The choice of a field of endeavor and the daily effort to excel therein is the road to success, whether in business or in law or in medicine or in teaching. To quote Colegrove:

> Practically the same qualifications that make one successful in other callings will win success in teaching, thorough knowledge of the work to be done, attention to business . . . and a willingness to do more than is absolutely required of one—these are the qualities that win respect and commend success everywhere.[11]

What is all-important is the choice of a subject, that really holds one's interest, of a hobby one may ride fast and hard. The truly interested teacher will not be satisfied to be merely a page ahead of his pupils. As Professor James says, he will have the ambition to know everything worthwhile written in his field. Muenster-

[11] *Loc. cit.*, 5.

berg [12] appositely remarks, "He alone can give information in an interesting way who might give a hundred times more than he has a chance to give." And again,[13] "It is the greatest defect of the American school life that too many teachers are standing before their pupils with a knowledge which has been crammed the night before and which lacks a background of serious, thorough study." And Bishop Spalding [14] rightly observes, "When we cease to learn, we cease to be interesting."

By all means then let the university graduate be encouraged to continue his studies, to grow in knowledge and in culture. The means thereto should not be denied him: an adequate library, the necessary periodicals, the opportunity to visit other schools and profit by their methods, to join scientific societies and attend their meetings, and above all sufficient leisure to pursue his studies.

In this connection the question may be put whether teachers should engage in pastoral work. For professors of moral theology, canon law and fundamental theology and kindred subjects pastoral work supplies practical training, which is well-nigh indispensable. Other teachers may find therein a relaxation from the duties of the classroom. As long as it does not hinder them in their primary duties to their students, I do not see why it should not be permitted. For others pastoral work may prove a serious drain on their nervous energy and a positive hindrance to effective teaching. To demand pastoral work of such is to run counter to the best interests of the individual and the Order.

Burdening the teacher with work foreign to his sphere is not the only danger to be guarded against. There is also the danger of overburdening him with classes. The Committee on Standards of the American Council of Education has with good reason put up as a standard that "teaching schedules exceeding 16 hours per week per instructor . . . should be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency." [15] Not only will overwork lower educational efficiency; it will also render research impossible. And research, as Bertrand Russell says, "is at least as important as education when we are considering the functions of universities in

[12] *Psychology and the Teacher*, 321.
[13] *Vocation and Learning*, 215.
[14] *Things of the Mind* (Chicago: A. C. McClurg and Co., 1899), 46.
[15] L. V. Koos, Ph. D., *The Junior College* (Research Publications of the University of Minnesota, Education Series, Number 5), 660.

the life of mankind. New knowledge is the chief cause of progress, and without it the world would soon become stationary." [16] And Muensterberg says, " Work toward real advancement of knowledge is the proper sphere of the college teacher and is the very essence of the life of any teacher in the graduate school." [17]

It is not necessary to prove to you the value and necessity of special university training for you belong to an Order that even in its early decades maintained illustrious houses of study at Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge, and which can in consequence point to sons like St. Bonaventure, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, and Occam. From your reading of history you will know that the period of the greatest prestige of the Franciscan Order coincided with the period when special emphasis was laid on the systematic post-graduate training of its teachers. The glorious 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries, all reveal Franciscans eminent in the fields of literature, natural sciences, philosophy, theology, statesmanship, diplomacy, in a word in practically every field of human endeavor. In the last century a renaissance of Franciscan scholarship has set in. It has been due in large measure to the efforts of university trained men. The work of these eminent scholars and teachers should incite in all of us a spirit of noble emulation and the high resolve to carry on the good work they have begun as befits the followers of him whose motto it was " non sibi soli vivere, sed aliis proficere."

DISCUSSION

CLAUDE MINDORFF, O.F.M.:—The process of professorial production, if you will excuse the alliteration, may well be compared to the harvesting of fruit, or any other natural product, in which we can distinguish three stages: picking, preparation, preservation. Fr. Vincent has followed this same division. His paper, though it does not exhaust the subject, nevertheless touches on nearly every point of major importance, and therefore there remains for me but to add a few supplementary remarks.

I heartily agree with the speaker, when he insists, that the professors do the picking of our future teachers, for who else could do it better? Who else should know the difference between good and bad professorial fruit?

Picking

Therefore it is my conviction, that not only should the professors be consulted at the time of ordination of their students, but that they should from the very beginning direct some exercises or tests to this very task of picking out their future colleagues. Sending a student to a university is not intended as a reward of virtue, but as a means to an

---

[16] *Loc. cit.*, 311.

[17] *Psychology and the Teacher*, 322.

end, *viz.*, to the end of producing a good professor, and only the proper material should be selected for that purpose.

Preparation

As to proper preparation, these same professors should take a hand in the formative process 1) during the regular course, by instilling into all students, but especially into the prospective professorial candidates, both the love and the correct methods of study; 2) by giving them occasion to write essays and deliver lectures in the weekly seminar, and thus to train both their faculty of research and their faculty of teaching; 3) by choosing, or helping the student to choose, the special subject which he is to cultivate and for which he must prepare himself; 4) lastly by guiding him in the beginning of his actual teaching. This last is done in the major universities, where the young teacher is not appointed as full-fledged professor, until he has spent some time as a mere assistant-professor, thus giving him time for immediate and more intense preparation.

Preservation

Proper preservation of fruit supposes cooking to kill the germs, and an amount of seasoning to make it palatable. Of course I do not wish to drive the simile too far by hinting that our professors should be canned or pickled; but the love of study and ability to teach, which take such an amount of time and expense to develop, need careful preservative treatment, otherwise all our labors shall be in vain, at least as far as professorial production is concerned. And here I wish to mention both a negative and a positive means. Negatively, a professor, who wishes to remain faithful to his vocation, must devote his whole time and interest to his subject. He cannot afford to diversify his occupations, or multiply them beyond his own field, no more than a farmer can afford to be a postmaster or a grocer, unless he wishes to give up farming. Even the *Cura animarum* can not be undertaken by a professor, who wants to preserve his love of study and devote his life to teaching. Not only will his time be divided, but the care of souls is so attractive to young and zealous priests, that once a professor finds himself devoted to pastoral work, the Order will have lost a professor.

The positive means I propose, are the different helps, that are found 1) in the reading of scientific periodicals in his branch of teaching, with occasional contributions from his own pen, and 2) in the companionship of those, who like himself are devoting their lives to teaching. Thus by keeping his mind in touch with the minds of others of the same trend and interest, the young professor will give strength and growth to his own interest and enthusiasm, which are so necessary to the development and conservation of professional talent.

FELIX M. KIRSCH, O.M.Cap.:—In connection with the subject of teacher training, I should like to direct your attention to a weak point in our system of education: our teachers do too much for their pupils, and our pupils do too little. Not that teacher is the best who communicates most knowledge to his pupils, but he who trains his pupils to acquire knowledge and skill by self-activity. The pupil will fully possess only that knowledge and skill which he has acquired by exercising his own faculties. The teacher should therefore content himself with taking the subordinate rôle of prompter and inspirer instead of displaying before his pupils his feats of rhetoric. His constant aim should be to make his pupils stand on their own two feet. He should constantly act on the principle that what counts in the end is not what the teacher does, but what he gets his pupils to do. What counts in the long run is not the quantity of information that has been acquired, but the fact that the pupil has so developed his

Doing too Much for Our Pupils

faculties that he can acquire knowledge and utilize it independently of the teacher. The teacher should for this reason never say what the pupil himself might say, and should never supply him with what he might find alone.

It is obvious that we cannot grow a student's body, and it should be equally obvious that we cannot grow a student's mind. Yet, modern educational practice would seem to say that we can do the latter. As to the student's physical growth, we may surround the boy with conditions favorable to his growth, but he himself must do the growing. He must do the eating, the exercising, the sleeping, the bathing. Nobody else can eat, exercise, sleep, or bathe for him.

Self-Activity in Our Schools

If only every teacher would bear in mind that the conditions are very much the same with regard to the student's intellectual growth. But instead we find the teachers coming to the student's assistance in every possible way, explaining before the student has really tried to comprehend, filling out his imperfect sentences, pointing out his errors, most of which the student knows very well are errors, and at every point anticipating healthy effort on his part. Should we, then, be surprised if the school in so many cases stunts the mental growth of the student? When the school receives him, he is a bright, wide-awake, self-active little fellow. But let him be graduated from our schools, and he will often be neither bright, nor wide-awake, nor self-active.

There is but one remedy. The student must be forced back on himself. He must have just as much help as is necessary, to place him in a position to help himself, and no more. This amount varies with the student, but its limit in any case is a sacred line, over which the teacher passes at the student's peril. The teacher must more and more withdraw himself. The best educational discipline is self-discipline, and, in its final resolution, there is no education but self-education.

Every time a student acts for himself, he grows stronger. Whenever someone else does his work he grows weaker. Let the process of outside assistance go on year after year, and failure is inevitable. To develop his arm, the student must use his arm. The law applies equally to the brain. No one can do for another what the latter can do for himself, without interfering to that extent with his growth. Growth is from within and is brought about, consciously or unconsciously, by the acts of the person who desires to grow. Whenever a teacher does for a student what the student could have done for himself, he deprives him of the right and opportunity to grow; if he persists in such a treatment, he stunts the student's growth; if he could do absolutely everything for the student the student would not grow at all.

The simplest and most perfect test of the value of a teacher's work is the amount of self-activity developed in the students. The great aim of every teacher should be to discover new methods of arousing vital interests in his students as the true basis for increased self-activity on their part. Self-activity lies at the basis of all good teaching. The lack of it explains many failures. To grasp its full import will revolutionize many a teacher. What a change would there be in many a schoolroom if the teacher could be induced to act on the principle that the best school is the one in which the teacher speaks least and the students speak most. Such a school is apt to develop those qualities upon which the student's success in life will depend most, namely, power and skill. And it is the development of power and skill that should be the aim of the teacher, and not the storing of the student's mind or—as is too often the case—of his memory only.

I must here content myself with stating the principle of self-activity. I have tried elsewhere to illustrate the principle as applied to different subjects

in our curriculum: "Teaching Latin as a Living Language," *Ecclesiastical Review*, April, 1924; "The Teaching of English in the Preparatory Seminary," *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, Nov., 1920; "The Teaching of History," *Report of the Franciscan Educational Conference*, 1922; "The Teaching of Science in our Catholic High Schools and Colleges," *Catholic School Journal*, Jan., 1924. I have treated the subject also in *The Catholic Teachers' Companion* and in *Practical Aids for Catholic Teachers.*

I shall conclude with repeating that we should welcome whatever gives promise of fitting our students for the grim battle of life. Our students will one and all have to engage in single combat on this battlefield. No parent, no teacher, no superior even, can really help much when their backs are up against the wall; and that is why the very greatest service any teacher can do to any student is to bring home to him in good time that alone he was born, alone he must die, and alone he must decide for himself everything in life that really matters. It would seem to me that if we would best prepare our students for this great struggle, we should make them depend as soon as possible upon their own resources. Do you agree with the man who has said: He is the best teacher who makes himself useless to his students?

I realize that I have treated only one phase of a large subject. But unfortunately, "non tantum mors instat, sed etiam vita," and hence I must forego the pleasure of presenting a digest of one of the most comprehensive treatises I have ever seen on the subject of Franciscan education, *viz.*, the *Letter on Seraphic Schools* written in 1917 by the Most Rev. Fr. Venantius of Lisle-en-Rigault, Minister General of the Friars Minor Capuchin.

INDEX

Abelard, 25.
Adam Marsh, 33.
Alexander of Hales, 25 f., 33, 42, 83.
Alexander IV, Pope, 36, 83.
Angelus of Clavasio, 7, 32.
Anselm, St., 25.
Antony of Padua, St., 3, 31, 33.
Antwerp, Biblical school at, 7.
Archambault, Simon Joseph, O.F.M., 35 f.
Archeology, study of, 70.
Archivum Franciscanum Historicum, 52.
Aristotle, 30, 57.
Artlessness, 27.
Arts course, 58 f.
Astronomy, study of, 69.
Augustine, St., 15, 24 f., 35.

Bacon, Roger, ix, 5, 7, 42 f., 112.
Bartholomaeus Anglicus, 7.
Benedict, St., 21.
Benedict XV, Pope, 81, 89.
Benedictines, 54.
Bernardine of Siena, St., 6.
Bernardino dal Vago, XXVII.
Berthold of Ratisbon, 6.
Biology, study of, 69.
Bologna,
  Franciscan School of, 7, 41.
  house of study at, 23 f., 32.
Bonaventure, St., ix, 3, 4, 7, 12, 27, 30, 32 f., 35 f., 42, 44, 48, 57, 59 f., 83 ff., 112.
Botany, study of, 68 f.
Brugmann, 6.

Cambridge, Franciscan school at, 41.
Candidates for the Order, 50 f.
Canisius, St. Peter, 38.
Canonical legislation concerning studies for Religious, 65 ff.
Canon Law, study of, 70.
Capuchin Constitutions, 85.
Capuchins, 55, 64.
Catechetics, study of, 70.
Celano, 33, and *passim*.
Chemistry, study of, 69.
Church history, study of, 70.
Clareno, Angelus of, 32.
Code of Canon Law, 65 ff.
Colegrove, Chauncey B., 104, 110.
Colleges, seraphic, 66 ff.
Collegio di San Antonio, 66, 76, 108 f.
Collegio di Sant' Isidoro, 7.
Collegio San Buonaventura, 7, 61.
Columbia University, 100.
Conferences of teachers, 63.
Confidence, inspiring of, 14.
Constitution of the United States, 100 f.
Constitutions, Capuchin, 85.
Conventions, educational, 63 f.
Cuthbert, Fr., O.M.Cap., 29, 45 f., 53, 55.

De la Haye, 7.
Denifle, Henry, O.P., 30.
Disputations, scholastic, 71.
Dobbins, Dunstan, O.M.Cap., 41 ff.
Dodo, Venantius, O.M.Cap., 85.
Dogmatic theology, study of, 70.
Dominicans, 30, 54.
Dominican School, 24 f.
Donum didacticum, 62 f.
Dorzweiler, Edwin, O.M.Cap., 26 f.
Duns Scotus, 33 ff., 83 f.

Educational conventions, 63 f.
Education,
  as a subject in our Franciscan schools, 86 ff.
  courses in, 63.
  St. Francis' attitude towards, 1 ff., 9 ff., 22, 26 ff.
  St. Francis' method of, 18 ff.
Ehrle, Cardinal, 29 f.
Elbel, 7.
Emerson, 62.
English, study of, 67.
Examinations, 71.
Example, force of, 19.

Felder, Hilarin, O.M.Cap., 9, 29, 57.
Fioretti, 21.
Fochtman, Vincent, O.F.M., 102 ff.
Foley, Theodosius, O.M.Cap., 27 ff.
Foreign languages, study of, 67 f.
Franciscan,
  asceticism, 26.

educational ideals, 41 ff.
education, characteristics of, 6 ff.
educators, 7, 64, 102 ff.
mysticism, 6.
Rule, 7, and *passim.*
School, 6, 24 f.
schools, education as a subject in our, 86 ff.
spiritual classics, 55 f.
teachers, training of, 62 f., 102 ff.
theology, 60 ff.
Francis of Assisi, St., v ff.
attitude towards learning, 1 ff., 9 ff., 26 ff.
method of education, 18 ff.

Gemelli, Agostino, O.F.M., 109.
Geography, study of, 68.
Gilson, Etienne, 35 f.
Girard, Gregory, O.M.C., 7, 37 ff.
Goethe, 62.
Greek, study of, 68, 70.
Gregorian Chant, 68, 70.
Guibert of Tournai, 36 ff.

Hammer, Robert, O.F.M., 9 ff.
Hebrew, study of, 70.
High schools, 72 f.
Hinsdale, B. A., 106.
History,
of the Franciscan Order, study of the, 51 f.
profane, study of, 68.
Church, study of, 70.
Honorius III, Pope, 24.
Hugh of Digne, 36.
Hugolino, Cardinal, 7 f., 32.
Human nature, knowledge of, 12.
Humbert de Romanis, 36.

Ideals, Franciscan educational, 41 ff.
Ignatius, St., 21.
Indians, schools for, viii, 7.
Individuality, understanding for, 11.
Innocent III, Pope, 15.
Intellectualism, 34.

Jacobi, F. H., 38.
Jacopone da Todi, Fra, 42.
Jacques de Vitry, 36.
James, William, 26, 110.
John of la Rochelle, 33.
John of Monte Corvino, 7.
John of Parma, 33.
John of Rupella, 5.
Jerusalem, school at, 108.
Jesuits, 38, 54.
Johnson, George, 99.

Kant, 37.
Karlin, Athanasius, O.M.Cap., 64.
Kindliness, 12.
Kirsch, Felix M., O.M.Cap., v ff. 62 ff., 113 ff.
Knight, F. B., 103.
Knighthood, ideals of, 21.
Kraus, Josaphat, O.F.M., XXXII.

Lampen, Willibrord, O.F.M., 84.
Latin in lectures, use of, 77 f.
Latin, study of, 67.
Leadership, art of, 11 ff.
Learning, St. Francis' attitude towards, 1 ff., 9 ff., 22, 26 ff.
Ledochowski, Fr., S.J., 81.
Le Monnier, 29.
Leo XIII, Pope, 74, 79, 83, 90.
Liberty of action, 17.
Liberty of spirit, 15.
Liturgy, 5.
Longpré, Ephrem, O.F.M., 36.
Louis IX, St., 36.
Lully, Raymond, 7, 36.

Maas, Andrew, O.M.C., 37 ff.
Mabie, Hamilton Wright, 62.
Manning, Cardinal, 64.
Marius of Clavasio, 7.
Masons of the Southern Jurisdiction, 101.
Massaja, Cardinal, 7.
Mathematics, study of, 68 f.
Method, scholastic, 79.
Milan, Sacred Heart University at, 7.
Mills, Victor, O.F.M., 9.
Mindorff, Claude, O.F.M., 34, 112 f.
Mineralogy, study of, 69.
Modern education, need of studying, 81 f., 99.
Modernism, oath against, 74.
Moore, Thomas Verner, O.S.B., 110.
Moral theology, study of, 70.
Motivation, 18.
Mueller, Karl, 29 f.
Muensterberg, Hugo, 103 f., 110 f.
Mutual instruction, 38.

Natural History, study of, 68 f.
Natural sciences, study of, 68 f.
Nicholas of Lyra, 7.

Observation, power of, 12.
Observation teaching, 100.
Occam, 112.
Odoric of Perdonone, 7.
O'Leary, Conrad, O.F.M., 86 ff.
Oliger, Livarius, O.F.M., 109.
Oregon School Bill, 100.
Organization of the Franciscan Order, 17 f.
Oxford, Franciscan School of, 7, 41, 44.

Pace, Edward Aloysius, 103, 110.
Paris, Franciscan school of, 7, 41, 44.
Parish schools, 72.
Pastoral theology, study of, 70.
Patristics, study of, 70.
Peccham, John, 42.
Personality of the teacher, 62.
Pestalozzi, 38.
Peter of Gand, 7.
Peter of Staccia, 24.
Philosophy, 5.
  Franciscan, 57 f.
  St. Francis' influence on, 35 f.
  study of, 56 f., 68 ff.
Physics, study of, 68 f.
Pius XI, Pope, vi, 65 ff., 74, 79 f., 116.
Plassmann, Thomas, O.F.M., 1 ff.
Plato, 36.
Poetry, 20.
Poverty, Franciscan, 14 f.
Practice teaching, 100.
Prefect of studies, 72.
Preparatory seminary, 66 ff., 102, 115.
Preventive measures, 21 f.
Priest as a teacher, 88, 99 f.
Psychology, 6.
Punishment, 22 f.

Quaracchi, Collegio San Buonaventura at, 7, 61.
Quintilian, 103.

Rädle, M., O.M.C., 39.
Raymond Lully, 7, 36.
Regula regum, 37.
Reiffenstuel, 7.
Religious, studies of, 65 ff.
Repression and restraint, 22 f.
Reward and punishment, 19.
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 37.
Russell, Bertrand, 102, 111.

Sabatier, Paul, 29 f.
Sacred art, study of, 70.
Sacred music, study of, 68.
Sailer, Johann Michael, 105.
Salamanca, Franciscan School of, 7, 41.
San Pietro in Montorio, 7.
Schaaf, Valentine T., O.F.M., 65 ff.
Schools, exemption of, 72 f.
Schwarz, Berthold, 5.
Scotus, John Duns, ix, 7, 42, 44, 60, 112.
Scripture, 43.
  study of, 70.
Self-activity, 113 ff.
Seminary, preparatory, 66 ff., 102, 115.
Seraphic college, 66 ff., 102, 115.
Shields, Thomas Edward, 90, 93, 98 f.
Simplicity, 27.
Sixtus V, Pope, 83.
Spalding, John Lancaster, 107, 111.
Spiritual classics, Franciscan, 55 f.
Spiritual Exercises, 54.
Spirituality,
  fostering of, 56.
  Franciscan, 52 f.
Spirituals, party of, 5.
Sporer, 7.
Staccia, Peter of, 32.
Statuta pro studiis regendis, 66 ff.
Studies,
  for Religious, canonical legislation on, 65 ff.
  interruption of, 75 f.
  prefect of, 72.
  term of, 75 f.
Summer schools, attendance at, 64, 96 f., 101.

Teachers,
  conferences of, 63.
  personality of, 62.
  selecting our, 102 f., 112 ff.
  training of, 62 f., 102 ff.
Teaching, inefficient, 88 f.
Term of studies, 75 f.
Testament of St. Francis, 49.
Theodorich of Coelde, 6.
Theology, 43, 59 ff., 70 ff.
  ordination after the third year of, 76.
Thomas of Aquinas, St., 34 f., 57, 59 f., 85.
  adhering to, 78 ff.

Ubertino of Casale, 31.
Universities, attendance at, 76 f., 107 ff.

Vecchierello, Hubert, O.F.M., 98.
Venantius, Fr., O.M.Cap., 115.
Vernacular, study of the, 67.
Victorines, 6.
Villedieu, Alexander, 7.
Vocation, education in, 47 ff.
Voluntarism, 6 f., 19, 34.

Wadding, Luke, 7.
Wessenberg, General H. von, 38.
William of Orleans, Bishop, 36.
Will, primacy of the, 6 f., 19, 34.
Witzel, Maurus, O.F.M., 108.
Work, St. Francis and duty of, 49 ff.
Writing in our schools, 71.

Ximenez, Cardinal, 7.

Zamora, John Giles, 7.
Zawart, Anscar, O.M.Cap., 28 ff., 36 ff., 84 f.
Zoölogy, study of, 68 f.

CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL UNION
3 0311 00115 6277

WITHDRAWN

LC 495 .F7 F72 1929
Franciscan Educational
Conference 1929 :
Franciscan education

3 0311 00115 6277

CO-ARL-960